DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 485 HE 008 073

TITLE	The Danforth and Kent Fellowships. A Quinquennial Review.
INSTITUTION	Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Mo.
PUB DATE	12 Apr 76
NOTE	102p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies; Comparative Statistics; *Educational Finance; Education Vouchers; Employment Patterns; *Fellowships; *Foundation Programs; Graduate Surveys; *Higher Education; Question Answer Interviews; Questionnaires; *Scholarship Funds; Statistical Surveys; Student Costs; *Student Financial Aid; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS	*Danforth Fellowships; *Kent Fellowships

ABSTRACT

The objectives, procedures, and recipients of the Danforth and Kent Fellowships are reviewed in a report based on questionnaires, letters, and interviews. The background and philosophy, along with selection and award procedures, of the foundation are outlined, followed by a description of the methodology of the study. Details of the fellows themselves include personal statistics (age and sex, marital status, minority representations, types of institutions attended), graduate experience, professional experience (where employed, academic rank, tenure, educational objectives, off-campus activities, fellows as institutional shapers), and nonacademic employment. Data were correlated that indicate that not only are Danforth and Kent Fellows producing scholarly works comparable to faculty of medium-prestige institutions, but they are also carrying heavier teaching loads than faculty in those institutions. It is concluded that fellowship holders characteristically take active roles in institutions of higher education in the areas of teaching and scholarship as well as in the additional areas of community responsibility, largely defined. The significance of the fellowship program is examined. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125485

THE DANFORTH AND KENT FELLOWSHIPS
A QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW

THE DANFORTH FOUNDATION
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
APRIL 12, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008073

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	i
I.	BACKGROUND	1
II.	PHILOSOPHY	4
III.	SELECTION and AWARD PROCEDURES	8
IV.	DESIGN and METHODOLOGY of the STUDY	12
	Sample	13
	Interviews	16
	Other Data-gathering Techniques	16
	Note on Methodology	17
V.	THE FELLOWS	19
	PERSONAL STATISTICS	
	Age and Sex	20
	Marital Status	20
	Minority Representation	21
	Types of Institution Attended	22
	THE GRADUATE EXPERIENCE	
	Fields of Scholarly Interest	23
	Aspects of the Graduate Experience	26
	THE PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	
	Where Employed	27
	Academic Rank	28
	Tenure	29
	Educational Objectives	31
	Fellows as Institutional Shapers	44
	Off-Campus Activities	51
	NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT	53
	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	56
VI.	THE DANFORTH EXPERIENCE	63
VII.	THE FELLOWSHIP CONCEPT IN A CHANGING CONTEXT	71
VIII.	THE DANFORTH and KENT FELLOWSHIPS - SOME FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS	82
	FOOTNOTES	86
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	88
	INDEX TO APPENDICES	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Completion of Doctoral Degrees	11
II.	Return of Questionnaires	15
III.	Sex of Fellows	20
IV.	Current Marital Status	21
V.	Minority Representation	22
VI.	Field of Study and Scholarly Interest	23
VII.	Year of Highest Degree Received	24
VIII.	Nature of Employing Institution	27
IX.	Undergraduate Enrollment at Current Institution	28
X.	Academic Rank	29
XI.	Tenure Rate of pre-1968 Ph.D. Recipients	30
XII.	Tenure vs Size of Undergraduate Institution	31
XIII.	Emphasis Given to Educational Objectives	33
XIV.	Comparison of Teaching Style with Colleagues	35
XV.	Research and Scholarly Interests	38
XVI.	Work Published for Non-academic Audience	39
XVII.	Measures of Research and Scholarly Interests	39
XVIII.	Number of Articles Published in Academic and Scholarly Journals	40
XIX.	Number of Professional Writings Published or Accepted for Publication in Last Two Years	40
XX.	Form of Conflict Between Teaching and Research	41
XXI.	How Conflict Between Teaching and Research Resolved	42

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
XXII.	Interest Primarily in Teaching or Research	42
XXIII.	Attitudes About Institution and Students	45
XXIV.	Advocacy of Institutional Reform	46
XXV.	Advocacy of Departmental Reform	46
XXVI.	Advocacy of Institutional Reform Related to Tenure	47
XXVII.	Activity in Departmental Affairs Related to Tenure	47
XXVIII.	Activity in Faculty Governance	48
XXIX.	Opportunity to Influence Department Policies	48
XXX.	Opportunity to Influence Institution	48
XXXI.	Attitudes Toward Role Undergraduates Should Play	50
XXXII.	Attitudes Toward Role Graduate Students Should Play	51
XXXIII.	Number of Professional Organizations Memberships	52
XXXIV.	Leadership in Professional Organizations	52
XXXV.	Participation in Non-professional Organizations	53
XXXVI.	Current Employment in Non-Academic Occupations	54
XXXVII.	Participation in Non-professional Organizations--Persons in Non-Academic and Academic Positions	55
XXXVIII.	Comparison of Publishing Records of Fellows with National Sample	58
XXXIX.	Comparison of Teaching Loads of Fellows with National Sample	59
XL.	Comparison of Student Enrollments of Fellows with National Sample	60
XLI.	Comparison of Attitudes Toward Student Roles of Fellows with National Sample	61
XLII.	Comparison of Attitudes Re Institutional Effect on Creativity	62
XLIII.	Attitudes Toward Teaching as Criterion for Promotion	62

THE DANFORTH AND KENT GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

A QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW

PREFACE

If the unexamined life is not worth living, the unexamined commitments of a philanthropic foundation must deserve a similar fate. Or, to use the words of philosopher-historian Carl Becker, it's important every so often to look at the things that go without saying just to be sure they are still going. In this spirit of taking nothing for granted, the Trustees of the Danforth Foundation stipulated regular quinquennial reviews of its Graduate Fellowship Program. They were acknowledging, of course, that even though it may occur more slowly, change is as characteristic of the academic community as it is of all other facets of contemporary society. And, indeed, even in academia the tempo of change has accelerated in recent years.

The Danforth Foundation has been identified with education and humane values since its creation by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Danforth in 1927. These foci have both shaped and been served by the unique character of the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program established by the Board of Trustees in 1951. As the Foundation approaches its golden anniversary, and the Fellowship Program marks a quarter century of activity, it is especially timely to reexamine the major commitment of the Foundation's current resources, resources seriously deplenished by the recent ravages of recession and inflation. Is the Foundation making a wise investment? What is the evidence? Have conditions in the academic marketplace changed so drastically

that graduate study no longer needs to be subsidized? And is a program which places emphasis on the preparation of prospective teachers in higher education, especially one which seeks individuals with value-oriented concerns, any longer viable in the final decades of the twentieth century? These are fundamental questions, and we have searched for answers in this study.

In doing so, we have tried to achieve as broad a data base as possible on which our conclusions would rest. Previous Fellowship Program reviews dealt mainly with "input" measures--the characteristics of applicants, the selection procedures, progress made by Fellows toward terminal degrees, achievement of the Ph.D. as the culmination of the process, and some information on job performance after completion of the degree. In the past, little attention was concentrated on "outcome" measures--the placement and advancement of Fellows who go into teaching, the values and goals--individual and institutional--of Fellows as academics, indications of their fidelity to the objectives of the Fellowship Program throughout professional careers, and evidence of leadership by Fellows in their professional situations. At the request of the Board of Trustees, this study attempts to ascertain more broadly the impact of the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program than has heretofore been measured. We need to know what difference Danforth or Kent Fellowships made in the lives of recipients and in their professional careers. Only when this information is in hand can the Foundation determine its direction and future priorities in the field of graduate education.

To gather data, several approaches were used. Danforth and Kent Fellows from the years 1960, 1966 and 1970 were sampled, along with Near Misses (persons who reached the final stages but were not selected by the Advisory

Councils) and Woodrow Wilson Fellows from the same years in order to supply comparative information. A select number (55) were designated to be interviewed to gain further insights into the lives of persons who had and had not been involved in the Danforth Fellowship Program. Further information and perspectives were gleaned from persons who in some way had a sustained relationship with the Foundation, either as readers, interviewers, advisory council members or workshop participants. Special insights were provided in two commissioned papers, one written by Martin A. Kaplan of the Aspen Institute from his experience as a recent Danforth Fellow, the other by Louis O. Mink, Professor of Philosophy at Wesleyan University and Kent Fellow in the Class of 1947, whose experience bridges the years from the period of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education through the merger of the Kent and Danforth programs in 1962 on to the present. A study by Eugene Rice, Professor of Sociology at the University of the Pacific and Program Executive and Faculty Consultant with the Foundation in 1974-75, on the Danforth Fellows in Mid-Career also added useful perspective.

Our labors have been amply assisted and informed by numbers of people who participated in the conceptualization of the study, in the development of guidelines and instruments to carry it forward, and in the analysis of the findings and completion of the final report. We are especially indebted to the Fellowship Director, Warren Bryan Martin, who helped to establish parameters for the study and lent wisdom in guiding it. Dean Whitla of the Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation at Harvard was instrumental in focusing on topics for the assessment, in processing the data, and in analyzing the preliminary findings. His assistance and that of persons from his office were most valuable. Dr. Benson Snyder from the Division for

Study and Research in Education at MIT consulted on several occasions, helping to refine the focus of the study and providing useful and refreshing perspective. The interviewers--Mary Jo Clark, Sally Gaff, Susan Golden, Herbert Kells, Pamela Kepple, Virginia Landwehr, Charles Long, William May, Pat Rosenbaum, Elizabeth Simons, and Clifford Wing, were able to gather insights that no questionnaire alone could reveal. These additional observations were particularly cogent to the data analysis and development of the report.

All who so patiently and thoughtfully responded to our questionnaires, interviews, letters and telephone calls should know that their generous cooperation made this study possible. The Chairman of the Foundation's Board of Trustees, William H. Danforth, through his keen interest and personal observations, and the sustaining support of Dr. Gene L. Schwilck, President of the Foundation, added significantly to the progress of the study. Foundation Staff and personnel, particularly Rita Kwapiszeski and Eleanor Roling, deserve special thanks for their advice and assistance in compiling this document. And finally, but by no means least, our gratitude to Lillie Mae Rose whose dedication to the Danforth Fellowship Program throughout its twenty-five year history has provided continuity and a personal touch of immeasurable importance.

Susan Uchitelle

Robert Kirkwood

April 12, 1976

I. Background

Universities, foundations, and systematic graduate fellowship programs emerged on the American educational scene almost simultaneously about a hundred years ago. Their major impact in the United States, however, was expanded and accelerated chiefly in the period since World War II. The Danforth Foundation has thus been in the vanguard of both the foundation and fellowship fields during their most important and exciting years.

In response to the growing need for academic and professional education beyond the baccalaureate degree, several programs of financial aid for graduate study began in the early 1950's, funded by private and, for the first time, by substantial Federal government appropriations. The National Science Foundation graduate fellowships were inaugurated in 1952 with approximately 700 individual grants. By 1968, the total of all Federal grants for graduate students reached the staggering figure of 51,500 in a single fiscal year.[1]

Unfortunately, much of this involvement was mercurial, and it fell even more precipitously than it rose. In fiscal 1974 the Federal program had collapsed to a total of 6,600 fellowship and trainee supports; by 1975, Federal activity was limited to the National Science Foundation merit fellowship program offering a total of only 500 new awards.[2] These same years witnessed the rise of several privately funded activities in support of graduate students, nowhere nearly approaching the astronomical heights of the Federal programs, but nonetheless significant. For the most part

they too have declined, including the demise in 1971 of the Woodrow Wilson Fellowships which, on a larger scale, paralleled the Danforth Program during the 'fifties and 'sixties in providing financial aid to prospective college teachers. The net result, of course, has been to diminish drastically the opportunities for graduate education.

The Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program was neither mercurial nor magnitudinal during this period, pursuing a deliberate course through the years since the first Fellows were appointed in 1952. Three thousand students and nearly $40,000,000 later it is still active, but that is not to say the Program has existed in splendid isolation or remained unchanged through twenty-five years. Quite the contrary, as a few developments will show.

Kenneth I. Brown became the Foundation's first full-time Executive Director in 1951, and the Fellowship Program began that same year. Under "Kib" Brown's direction, the Fellowships were imbued with a strongly religious tone which was openly and explicitly stated:

> The Foundation is seeking to aid men of proved ability and leadership who recognize the place of religion in their personal lives and the work of education, and are seriously searching for religious maturity within the Christian tradition. . . . the Fellowship is not an inter-faith organization; it is conducted within the tradition of Protestant Christianity.[3]

Brown retired in 1961, and in the years to follow the religious emphasis declined. Some accused the Foundation of selling out to secularism, and it is true that the evangelical fervor of the 'fifties no longer characterizes its activities. Nevertheless, the most recent Fellowship brochure (1975) reflects the Program's continuing concern with religious and ethical issues:

In selecting Danforth, GFW, and Kent Fellows, special attention is given to four areas:

> ....
> Evidence of a concern for the relation of ethical or religious values to disciplines, the educational process, and to academic and social responsibility.[4]

Whereas Catholics and Jews were exceptions in the ranks of Fellows in the mid-fifties, by the mid-sixties the impact of ecumenicalism was reflected in a wide range of religious backgrounds and viewpoints among the Fellows, and so it continues.

The GFW and Kent Fellows mentioned above represent other important changes since 1951. Women were originally eligible for Danforth Fellowships, but in 1955 they were disqualified on the grounds that their attrition rates in graduate school were too high to warrant the investment of limited Foundation funds. Largely through the efforts of Dr. Jean Walton, who in 1962-63 worked with the Foundation during a sabbatical from her position as Dean of Women at Pomona College, the Fellowship competition was reopened to women in 1965. A decade later fully fifty percent of the candidates were women. In addition, and almost in seeming penance, Graduate Fellowships for Women were added to the Danforth Program in 1965, providing opportunities for mature women to resume graduate studies. A comprehensive ten-year review of that program was completed in 1975, and some of its conclusions will be taken into account in the recommendations resulting from this study.[5]

Kent Fellowships originated in 1923 as part of the program of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education, so named to honor Charles Foster Kent, distinguished Professor of Biblical Literature at Yale University from 1901 to 1925. When the Council could no longer sustain them,

support and administration of the Kent Fellowships were assumed by the Danforth Foundation in 1962, and the Council itself was reorganized as the Society for Religion in Higher Education. The Fellowship arrangement was originally for ten years, but the Kent awards soon became an integral part of the Foundation's Graduate Fellowship Program, and they are so treated in this study. In contrast to the Danforth Fellowships, which are available only to students initiating their graduate programs, men and women could apply directly to the Foundation for Kent awards after completing at least one year of graduate study, although they needed the endorsement of a member of their graduate faculty.

Over the course of fifteen years since Kenneth Brown's retirement in 1961, each of the five succeeding Directors added his personal style and emphasis to the Program. Those same years included the most tumultuous and traumatic period in the history of American higher education, a period which shook to their very roots those educational principles and practices that it did not shatter entirely. Yet withal, not only was the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program sustained, but its fundamental philosophy remained remarkably intact. The nature of that philosophy and how it was implemented are examined in the next section of this report.

II. Philosophy

It was not by chance that the Graduate Fellowship Program was established by the Danforth Foundation or that it has been sustained these many years. The Foundation began and continues as a philanthropy concerned with people and values, faithfully reflecting the beliefs of its founders. Occasionally there have been grants for bricks and mortar, but the vast

preponderance of its spending has been for programs and activities centering on the intellectual and value orientations of individuals. Education was the natural field to till, and how better than through the preparation of outstanding men and women with a vocation for teaching.

The Fellowship Program was intended to be different, to be more than merely a source of money distributed anonymously through monthly checks. It was to use both meanings of the term fellowship: one, a form of financial grant to graduate students; the other, and more important, a group sharing similar interests and experiences on equal terms in a congenial atmosphere. While Kenneth Brown is most readily identified with the early religious character of the Danforth Program, he has not always received his due for fostering the broader fellowship concept. Selection procedures were designed to be as humane as possible (see Section III), but other features of the Program and especially the personal involvement of Dr. Brown and succeeding Directors set a tone which has made Danforth Fellowships truly different. Individual contacts have been cultivated and sustained over the years by the Directors, Staff members, and especially Miss Lillie Mae Rose in a manner and on a scale unbeknown to any other fellowship activity.

The Conference programs, all of which were initially mandatory, brought the Fellows together in the first year, with an optional but strongly encouraged final-year conference, yet the purpose was essentially unchanged and remains so even today.

The Fellowship Program was intended to provide added dimensions to the lives of recipients, dimensions that the Foundation felt would make a difference in the lives of Fellows. First were the presumed benefits of

the fact of selection--being named a Danforth (or later a Kent) Fellow in the presence of literally thousands of worthy competitors. Selection was bound to affect a person's morale, self-confidence, and resolve or determination. Second was the "fellowship of the Fellowships"--the coming together of Fellows in the general conferences and workshops. Here the concern for values, assumptions, and the socio-religious aspects of personal and professional life were stated, reviewed, challenged and defended. Illustrative of the issues confronted is the list of topics treated at the 1968 First-Year Conference:

"Revolution in Elementary Education"
"Privacy and the New Technology"
"Religion in a Secular World"
"The American Family: Dying or Changing?"
"American Politics and the Idealism of the Young"
"Methodology and the Social Sciences"
"The Urban Crisis: A Way Out of the Woods?"
"The Artist and the Community: Mixed Media and the New Tribe"
"Popular Culture and the Role of the Teacher"
"Non-logical Truth: Poetry and Religion"
"Which American History Should We Teach?"
"Problems of Morality in Scientific Investigation"
"The Origin of Evil"
"Possibilities for Constitutional Reform"
"What Graduate School Is About and How to Get Along There"

Distinguished scholars and teachers willingly accepted invitations to participate, as much for their own self-renewal as for the opportunity to initiate prospective colleagues into the profession. Not all were academics, however, and leaders in religion, government, business, labor, and diverse other callings shared in the cogitations and camaraderie of weeks or weekends at Camp Miniwanca in Michigan, or later at Illinois Beach State Park in Zion, and other locations.

The many and varied contacts that Fellows developed with each other,

on their own campuses or on the national level, sometimes led to lifelong friendships, marriages, often to warm and sustaining professional relationships. All of this was consistent with the philosophy of the Fellowship Program, steeped as it was in the Judaic-Christian ethos and committed to the traditions of liberal learning in a community of scholars.

The basic purposes of Danforth activity in the general fellowship field from the beginning have been:[6]

(1) To identify and encourage persons of exceptional promise who desire to become excellent teachers, usually in colleges and universities, but also in precollegiate institutions.

(2) To improve teaching and its corollary, learning, by increasing the number of teachers who are not only academically excellent, but who also perceive value questions as central to education.

(3) To extend the outreach of the Danforth Foundation through the work of outstanding people who may be expected to have sustained beneficial influence on secondary and higher education . . . through leadership positions in colleges and universities.

Toward fulfillment of these purposes the selection criteria for Danforth and Kent Fellowships were basically three:[7]

- academic accomplishment and intellectual power
- aptitudes for and a commitment to teaching
- evidence of ethical/moral/religious sensibilities.

Throughout the years these have never been separated, ranked, or differentiated in terms of their importance. The goal has been to select Fellows whose attitudes and actions would show these elements to have come together in a creative and effective synthesis. By virtue of its philosophy and its high aspirations, the Graduate Fellowship Program has posed a major challenge to those responsible for selecting Fellows in the annual competition.

III. Selection and Award Procedures

The procedures for nomination and selection of Danforth and Kent Fellows are intricate and deliberate, with the intent of locating persons who indicate the greatest promise for success according to the criteria established by the Foundation. The selection and award procedures are similar for both Danforth and Kent Fellowships except for the manner of nomination. Kent Fellows may nominate themselves, and any person into a second year of graduate study is eligible provided he/she can gain the endorsement of a faculty member of his/her graduate department.

Eligibility for the Danforth Fellowship is more involved. Letters explaining the intent and purpose of the Danforth Fellowship Program are sent to college presidents who, in turn, are asked to appoint liaison officers who work with a campus committee and other faculty in an effort to identify nominees. The liaison officer officially nominates the person or persons (the number of nominees ranges from 2 to 5 per campus, determined by the undergraduate enrollment). All accredited institutions of higher education are encouraged to enter persons in the competition, and candidates come from all parts of the country (see appendix).

Once those persons interested are determined eligible, they receive an application folder and must return all completed documentation to the Danforth Foundation before the deadline date, usually around mid-December. All information needed by the Foundation--personal biography, both professional and personal recommendations, GRE scores, undergraduate and any graduate transcripts--must be in the Foundation office before the Reading

Committee meets about mid-January. The number of completed dossiers usually runs close to 2000 a year for the Danforth Fellowships, about 800 for the Kents.

The Reading Committees are groups of distinguished, exceptionally qualified men and women currently or formerly in the field of higher education. They are usually appointed by the Director of the Fellowship Program, frequently but not always from among persons having had connections with the Danforth Foundation, either as past Fellows or by participating in some of the Fellowship activities. The Committee meets in St. Louis for an intensive work session, normally spending two or three full days reading the completed folders, weighing each applicant's credentials according to the criteria. Geographical location or personal need do not enter into the selection process at this stage, although they may be considered in the final decisions.

Each folder is read at least twice and the candidate evaluated as outstanding, good or fair, with interview or no interview recommended by the reader. If there is a difference of opinion between the readers, there is a third reading for a final determination. Approximately 20 percent of the Danforth applications go to interviewers while roughly 13 percent of the Kent applications reach that stage.

Again, interviewers are selected by the Fellowship Director and have competencies similar to those of the readers. The interview stage is a vital time in the selection process, and it is the point where the first direct contact occurs between the Danforth Foundation and potential Fellows. Interviews are set up around the country on a one-to-one basis for the

Danforth applicants. Interviewers meet approximately five candidates per day, preparing a detailed report on each, and deciding whether or not to recommend a candidate to the Advisory Council. They must help to determine if a candidate has the potential to make a contribution to higher education, perhaps by improving the moral quality of educational leadership, and/or by enhancing the importance of teaching as a vocation. Interviewers use the same criteria for evaluating Kent Fellowship candidates, but a team of interviewers meets with each prospect and the team report either recommends a candidate to the Advisory Council or not.

Approximately 175 Danforth and 75 Kent applicants are recommended to the Advisory Councils for final selection. In the 1960's approximately 100 to 125 Danforth Fellowships were awarded annually, and 50 Kents; in 1975, 65 Danforth and 25 Kent Fellowships were awarded. There are separate Advisory Councils for Danforth and Kent Fellowships, again persons who are either past Danforth and Kent Fellows or others involved in academe (again the Director's prerogative), who are invited to serve for three-year terms. They also meet in St. Louis, spending two days carefully and conscientiously rating applicants for the final Fellowship selection. Members of the Advisory Councils receive full information about the candidates before their meetings and are asked, in the light of the general selection criteria, to rank each candidate from 5 to 1, as follows:

5) outstanding

4) strong candidate

3) solid candidate with good potential

2) doubtful

1) reject

They are, in addition, asked to make further comments about each applicant. When the Councils meet, they make the final determinations, and once the selections are made, winners are notified by letter from the Director of the Fellowship Program. Successful candidates begin the Fellowship the next fall unless otherwise stipulated.

The entire selection process is unusually thorough and elaborate. It should be noted that those members of the academic profession engaged in the process have benefited personally and professionally from the perspectives and insights gained from reviewing the candidates' qualifications and personal statements of purpose and philosophy. One may rightly ask whether the process successfully identifies candidates for graduate study. The evidence speaks for itself:

Table I

Completion of Doctoral Degrees

Danforth	97%
Kent	98.3%
Woodrow Wilson	92%

As for the success of the Danforth and Kent Fellowships in contributing to the development of prospective college teachers with a concern for ethical values, the remainder of this report will attest.

IV. Design and Methodology of the Study

This study was designed to document the record of the Graduate Fellowship Program and to attempt to assess its significance for the participants as well as for the Foundation. The goals of the Danforth Program broadly defined are to synergize the best of an ethical and moral vision with a capacity for objective analysis in persons who, potentially, could become effective forces within and without the academic environment. Almost inevitably, this leads to two critical questions: Do Danforth Fellows, more than other graduate students, reflect their commitment in any affirmative way, such as concern for the community, dedicated teaching, interest in students and awareness of their needs, involvement in interdisciplinary areas and sensitivity for the humanities? Does being a Danforth Fellow enhance the ability of a person to serve more effectively in these areas, or is it presumptuous to suggest that a Danforth Fellowship makes a difference?

The study was designed to draw from many perspectives in an effort to answer these difficult and penetrating questions. We sought to obtain a sample which would give a comparative dimension to this study; that is, an opportunity to compare Danforth Fellowship holders with other graduate students--namely, Woodrow Wilsons, and Near Misses who in all likelihood went on to graduate school. The decision was made to gather data through questionnaires to be sent to all former graduate students participating in the study. The data from these questionnaires, along with that obtained from a smaller sample to be interviewed, was intended to give a broad base of general information. In addition, questions could be asked on a questionnaire

that would produce data to be compared with other similar studies for a larger view of graduate students during the period of 1960-1975.

Structured interviews with fifty-five (55) individuals representing the entire sample of participants were carried out by experienced interviewers in central locations throughout the country. The interviewers attempted to get at, in much greater detail than any questionnaire could accomplish, facets of an individual's life that might indicate a different emphasis or commitment between Danforth and non-Danforth persons. Letters were requested from persons involved in Fellowship activities--readers, interviewers, advisory council members, workshop participants--asking for their views and observations about the Danforth selection criteria and their perceptions of effects the Danforth Program may have had on Fellows as well as on themselves over time.

The study took persons from three specific periods as representative of Fellows out of study who have had time to become established in their profession, and of Fellows still in study. The research attempted to look at these Fellows to determine: what some of their viewpoints are today about teaching and learning; if they are in any substantive manner contributing professionally; what some short-term and long-range outcomes of the Fellowship experience actually were; and if they manifested any special behaviors, in service rendered to the community or with students, that reflected an orientation different from other comparable graduate students or faculty persons.

Sample

The study sample consisted of as many recipients as could be located from the Danforth and Kent classes of 1960, 1966, 1970 (Kent classes added

the years 1961, 1962, 1965, 1969, since these classes were smaller), along with Woodrow Wilson recipients and both Kent and Danforth Near Misses for those same years. Each person was sent a letter (see appendix) describing the study along with a questionnaire to be filled out and returned. One attempt was made to follow up on all non-responders and a second follow-up was made for Danforth and Kent Fellows in an effort to get as large a response as possible. The initial letter with a questionnaire was sent out on October 28, 1975, and on November 25 the first follow-up letter was sent to all persons who had not responded. On December 15 a second request for response, with another copy of the questionnaire, was sent only to Danforth and Kent Fellows who had not previously responded.

The final sample consisted of 520 responses out of a possible total of 745, or approximately 70 percent overall. More than 79 percent of the Danforth Fellows (207 out of 260), and 78 percent of the Kent Fellows (120 out of 153) responded. The rate of return for the Near Misses was 66 percent (75 out of 114), a higher rate of return than anticipated. In this group were all the Near Misses from the Kent and Danforth selections from the years 1960, 1966, 1970 who could be located. The return for the Woodrow Wilson Fellows was 55 percent (118 out of 216), also a high rate of return considering that these persons had no connection with the Danforth Foundation.

Following is a tabulation of the returns:

Table II

Fellowship	Questionnaires Sent to Correct Address	Questionnaires Returned	Percent Return
Danforth	260	207	79.6
Kent	153	120	78.4
Woodrow Wilson	216	118	54.5
Near Misses	114	75	65.7
Totals	743	520	70

Questionnaire - Design and Content

There were three questionnaire forms, designed jointly by Dean Whitla from Harvard, Ben Snyder from MIT, and Foundation personnel. Separate questionnaires were sent to Danforth and Kent Fellows, Woodrow Wilson Fellows, and Near Misses. Many of the questions overlapped while other questions pertained only to a particular group. Once the questionnaire was formulated, it was tested on several Danforth recipients, changed, tried again and further refined to the point that it seemed likely to elicit information relevant to the problem being studied. It was then mailed to the sample. The questions covered not only demographic data, such as year of fellowship, field, graduate institution, backgrounds, job status, rank and publications, but also attitudinal and value questions which could be used as a comparison with the results of the Carnegie Commission study edited by Martin Trow on Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education.[8] The data gathered by the Trow team beginning in 1969 and published in 1975 on almost two hundred thousand faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students, included personal and demographic information as well as responses to attitudinal questions, and provide useful bases for comparison with the Danforth and Kent Fellows.

Interviews

The interview approach was developed in a manner comparable to the questionnaire. A determination was made that short, open-ended questions were most likely to elicit information not gleaned from a standard questionnaire. The interview schedules (see appendix) were sent to individuals who had been recommended as skilled interviewers and agreed to participate in the study. Interviewing was done in twelve major cities around the United States.

Dr. William H. Danforth, Chancellor of Washington University and Chairman of the Foundation's Board of Trustees, was interviewed by the authors of this report to gain the benefit of his dual perspectives. The authors also interviewed Miss Lillie Mae Rose to gain the advantage of her unequaled knowledge and insights derived from twenty-five years of continuous and intimate involvement with the Graduate Fellowship Program. Informal discussions were held by the authors with Fellows, Readers, Interviewers, and Faculty at conferences, reading sessions, and meetings of the Advisory Councils.

Other data-gathering techniques

Over one hundred letters were sent to people who had served as interviewers in the Fellowship selection process, readers, and Advisory Council members (see appendix), requesting information and comments on various aspects of the Fellowship Program. Inquiries were also sent to Presidents, Deans, and Vice Chancellors of twenty-two universities where at least six former Danforth and Kent Fellows currently hold faculty appointments, asking if the administrators were aware in any significant manner of the Fellows on their campuses.

From the variety of sources it was hoped that a complete and accurate account of the breadth and depth of the Danforth and Kent Fellowship Program would be forthcoming. It is important to remember that the Fellowship Program is multi-faceted, involving graduate Fellows, established faculty, department chairmen and administrators in many institutions. This assessment, therefore, touched indirectly on the effects of these varied kinds of involvement on all persons concerned.

Note on Methodology

It is difficult to find ways of measuring accurately the complex concepts which are at the heart of this study. For this assessment, a variety of techniques were used to approach the task; when each of the styles of data collection and analysis produced similar results, our confidence in the findings increased.

Questionnaires, interviews and personal reactions were collected from the four designated samples, along with impressions from others interested in the Danforth Program. An extensive questionnaire was designed to elicit responses on many facets of a faculty member's life style, his or her contribution to students, the institution, and the community at large. In addition to the usual areas of concerns for teaching, research and service, a number of questions addressed the area of values. The questionnaire, while primarily of pre-coded form, included questions which were open-ended. The responses to the open-ended questions were used in two ways; as statements of merit in their own right and in coded form where the responses became part of the formal data analyses.

The questionnaire analysis consisted primarily of comparisons between

the four samples and included the usual range of statistical tests. This ordering of the information made it possible to address the central question about whether the former Danforth and Kent Fellows differed noticeably from the comparison groups--Woodrow Wilson Scholars and the Near Misses in the Danforth Competition. A national sample of faculty members provided another comparison group through the data collected by Martin Trow and associates. Because of the magnitude of the Trow sample which included a breakdown by institutional type, this provided a useful perspective and effectively illustrated the unique qualities of the original four groups.

All questionnaire responses were keypunched on data-processing cards and several data runs were completed while reviewing the information for analysis. The written comments were set aside and scrutinized by Staff and consultants, and a detailed content analysis of these comments was made. Much of the general data from the questionnaires focused on position, academic connection, field of expertise, contact with students, attitudes toward teaching and research, personal teaching style and preferences, commitment to teaching, community involvement, institutional and personal conflict, and Danforth experience. The analysis of the additional comments focused on:

- meaning of the Danforth Fellowship program
- values of the individual reflected by his/her commitment
- teaching preferences
- advocacy of institutional reform
- personal involvement in committees
- personal effects of Danforth Foundation involvement

- impact of this experience in shaping personal perceptions of the academic profession.

The quantitative portions of the questionnaire data were subjected to a variety of statistical analyses. The findings from the factor analyses, analysis of variance, and regression equations provided relatively few new insights that were not already noted in the tabular comparisons; therefore, in the interests of parsimony these more complex analyses are with rare exception omitted from the report.

Interviews were conducted with eleven percent of the sample by experienced interviewers located around the country. They employed a semi-structured interview in the general form developed by sociologist Robert Merton, an expert in interview techniques. The Merton approach was coupled with a list of questions to insure that domains of particular interest were addressed. Interviews were audio-taped to make them available for analysis; in addition, the interviewers wrote summaries using as often as possible the words of the interviewees. This procedure, using on-site interviewers, made it possible for interviews to be conducted in a relatively short period and to provide a large amount of useful information. The interviews were analyzed essentially in the same manner as the questionnaires, with allowances for the greater range of their content.

V. The Fellows

"Who were the Fellowship holders?" A description of our sample indicates who these persons were, where they came from, where they are now, their personal and professional status, and their perceptions of graduate education and of the Danforth and Kent Fellowships.

PERSONAL STATISTICS

Age and Sex

The average age of a Danforth Fellow at the time of award was approximately 22.4 years, while Kent Fellows averaged 27.7 years, Woodrow Wilson Fellows were 22.5 years, and Near Misses averaged 24.8 years. In our sample the largest percentage of all fellowship holders in past years has been predominantly male, but it must be remembered that Danforth Fellowships from 1955-1965 were awarded only to men. Since the Fellowships became available to women again in 1965, the number of women recipients has markedly increased, and in 1975 more women than men received Danforth Fellowship awards. The ratio of Fellowship holders by sex during the decade 1960-1970 is as follows:

Table III

	M	F
Danforth	85%	15%
Kent	75	25
Woodrow Wilson	86	14
Near Misses	79	21

The Woodrow Wilson numbers are more typical of graduate school representation in earlier years, but even the Near Misses numbers are representative of the predominantly male orientation until the mid-60's.

Marital Status

Data indicate that most Fellows are married, have remained married, and thus reflect a stable marital life that has not shifted over the years. As we see from Table IV the largest percentage from the total sample is

married--63% of Danforths and 70% of Kents. However, Kents enter the program at a later date (the average current age of a Kent is 38 while that of a Danforth is 33) and many are married upon entry into the program. A larger percentage of Danforths (24%) than Kents (14%) are single at the beginning of the Fellowship years, but Danforth Fellows begin graduate study directly from college and it is presumed that fewer are married at that time. It is interesting to note that 55% of holders of the Graduate Fellowships for Women were married at the time of the award. Of that total group, 84% showed no change in marital status during their fellowship years, again reflecting greater stability than the national averages.

Table IV

Current Marital Status - Percent

	D	K	WW	NM
Married	63	70	66	62
Remarried	3	6	4	0
Separated	3	5	2	0
Single	24	14	21	37
Divorced	6	5	5	1
Widowed	1	0	2	0

Minority Representation

Minority representation during these years fell short of expectations in the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program. However, it was above average on the national scene and has been rising steadily over the last five years. Distribution of awards by minorities for 1960-1970 was as follows:

Table V

	D	K	WW	NM
Black	4%	7%	4%	0%
Oriental	2	1	0	0
American Indian	0	1	0	0
Spanish surname	0	2	0	0

These statistics are reflective of the general picture of minority enrollment in graduate schools in the Arts and Sciences. The identification and recruitment of talented minority students have lagged seriously in the areas of admission to graduate school and financial aid. Moreover, many minority students opt for seemingly more glamorous or utilitarian professions like law or social work where the potential for service and influencing society appear to be greater. Despite these constraints, to show eleven percent (11%) minority members among Kent Fellows and six percent (6%) among Danforth Fellows implies both concern and active recruitment, and indeed the Danforth Program led both Woodrow Wilson Fellows and Near Misses in the percentage of minority representation.

Types of Institution Attended

The data received indicate that Kent and Danforth Fellows came from all types of undergraduate institutions in all parts of the country. The largest percentage of Danforth Fellows (42%) came from private institutions, followed by church-related institutions (35%), and then the public universities (22%). When they went to graduate school the pattern was even more pronounced, the largest percentage going to private universities (75%),

with public institutions running a poor second (23%). For the Kents we find that the largest percentage attended private graduate institutions (68%) while most of the others attended public institutions. Only 4% of the Kents attended church-affiliated graduate institutions.

THE GRADUATE EXPERIENCE

Fields of Scholarly Interest

In view of the Danforth Foundation's values and commitments, it is not surprising that the highest number of Danforth and Kent Fellows are in the humanities fields. The Danforth Fellows, and to some extent the Kent Fellows, express interest in the social sciences as well. While Danforth Fellows are well represented in the natural sciences, these fields hold low interest for the Kents (Table VI).

Table VI

Field of Study and Scholarly Interest

	D	K	WW	NM
Humanities	51%	70%	55%	65%
Social Science	25	13	25	17
Natural Science	10	1	7	10
Mathematics	5	2	9	6
Other	9	12	4	2

While the humanities ranked highest among all Fellowship holders and persons who applied to the Danforth Foundation for graduate assistance, this is

probably accounted for largely by the fact that Federal fellowship programs during these same years were heavily oriented toward the natural sciences, mathematics, and to a lesser degree some of the social sciences. The orientation of the Danforth Program undoubtedly also affected the choices of those who became Fellowship candidates.

Table VII

Year of Highest Degree Received

	D	K	WW	NM
1960-1965	16%	14%	13%	no data
1966-1970	20	32	34	34%
1971-1975	64	54	53	66

As for time taken to complete the degree, we uncovered some interesting but not surprising information. On the average, Kent Fellows, from receipt of the B.A. to completion of the Ph.D., took 10 years, but a larger proportion of Kents were in the humanities. The fact that a number of Kents completed other degrees, chiefly in theology (B.D., M.Div., Th.D.), adds to the total length of time in post-baccalaureate study. It is also possible, because they were older, that Kents were more contemplative in their approach to dissertations. Danforth Fellows, on the other hand, took only 5.7 years to complete their highest degree, while Woodrow Wilsons took 5.5 years and Near Misses took 7 years. The Graduate Fellowships for Women awardees completed their degrees in comparable time, with 41% finishing in two to four years, while 23% took from five to seven years.

We see that the years in "actual graduate study" for the Ph.D. varied among the four groups and in some cases the difference was significant. Kent Fellows spent more years in graduate school (6.5 years) than any of the other Fellows. Danforth Fellows went directly into graduate school and completed their Ph.D. (5.4 years) without much of a break from the academic calendar, perhaps reflecting the energy and zeal of youth. In some cases they took a year out to teach or complete some research, but the majority went right through graduate study. Near Misses, who in many cases had to search for additional support, took longer than Danforth Fellows (5.7 years) but less time than Kent Fellows. Woodrow Wilson Fellows took the least time (4.9 years), but it can be surmised that they were under greater economic pressure in the first year of graduate study since their fellowships were only for one year. Even with institutional support, the Woodrow Wilson Fellows may have had a more difficult time making ends meet during their years in graduate school. These completion rates, with the exception of the Kent Fellows, indicate that the students were efficient in the pursuit of the Ph.D., especially since such a heavy percentage were in the humanities where candidates normally take longer to complete their doctorates.

It is difficult to interpret length of time taken for an advanced degree. After candidates finish their required course work, many activities occur under the guise of full-time study. In a personal interview, one Danforth Fellow stressed the importance of his additional years in graduate school for his professional development, stating that "it was during these two years that I had the time to acquire the skills of fine teaching."

Often the best of the graduate students (and this could apply to the Kent Fellows) are encouraged to write papers or participate in department research projects which would prolong the years of formal graduate study. It can also be hypothesized that Danforth Fellowship recipients, with their strong academic talents, are in a category where their theses should be published, tending to lengthen their time in graduate study in order to do the further research or revision necessary to produce a publishable work. Their financial support enabled them to proceed without interruption toward completion of their degrees even with publication efforts under way. Obviously, the length of time in doctoral study is a complex of variables hard to sort in specific terms, but there is no reason to believe that the Danforth Program either encouraged dilatoriness or was in any way abused by Fellowship recipients.

Aspects of the Graduate Experience

All persons surveyed were apparently satisfied with their graduate school experience, but Kent Fellows showed slightly more satisfaction than others (2.1 on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being the most satisfied). More striking, all persons indicated that they would still prefer to be college professors than anything else if they were to begin their careers again. In the face of the current job market and general cutback in higher education, this finding indicates an extraordinarily high commitment to the academic way of life, and former Danforth Fellows showed the highest commitment. Even in the face of prevailing sex discriminatory policies on many campuses, this same degree of commitment was found among women in the 1975 study of the Danforth Graduate Fellowships for Women.

During the graduate years all persons spent a significant amount of time on pedagogical activities, although Kent Fellows were more inclined to work in interdisciplinary courses than other Fellows, a quality they also exhibited by taking other degrees in addition to the Ph.D. in their field of study. Kent and Danforth Fellows more often led seminars or tutorials while in graduate school, and Kent Fellows enrolled in non-required courses outside of their field while also participating more frequently as teaching assistants.

THE PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Where Employed

The affiliation of the current employing institution is to some extent an indication of the predilections of the Fellows.

Table VIII

Nature of employing institution-percent of response

	D	K	WW	NM
Public	56	30	54	64
Private	33	52	31	18
Church Related	11	18	15	18

Kent Fellows are employed with greater frequency by private colleges than the other groups, and further, we find that Kents are employed at institutions with smaller undergraduate enrollments than other academics. We find that 53% of them are associated with institutions with undergraduate enrollments of 5,000 or less. The differences here are statistically significant. (See Table IX.)

Table IX

Undergraduate Enrollment at Current Institution

% Employed

	D	K	WW	NM
1,000	11	14	14	9
1,000-5,000	29	39	25	29
5,000-10,000	19	18	21	2
10,000-20,000	24	12	18	29
20,000 +	17	17	22	21

In contrast, we discover that Danforth Fellows are quite evenly distributed among small and large institutions alike. We did find that more Kents were in institutions that did not offer doctoral programs (56%--a finding in line with the fact they are at small institutions--versus 41% for Danforth Fellows). It is interesting to note that Kent Fellows prefer smaller institutions in which to work, and the data suggest that they have more consciously sought an environment in which they could play an influential role. As we shall discover, size of institution and sense of personal influence may be closely related to the fact that Kents feel they have been most effective in institutional reform and curricular change.

Academic Rank

In this area all Fellowship holders did extremely well, with Kent Fellows holding an edge at the professional level. In general, the differences among the groups in academic rank are small, but more Woodrow Wilsons

and Near Misses hold unranked or Lecturer appointments than either Danforth or Kent Fellows, positions which tend to be somewhat less permanent.

Table X

Academic Rank	Percentage			
	D	K	WW	NM
Professor	10	13	9	4
Associate Professor	23	29	28	24
Assistant Professor	47	47	35	54
Instructor	11	3	13	4
Lecturer	4	4	4	6
No Rank	5	4	11	8

Tenure

In a profession where two promotions make a career, tenure is a highly important watershed. The sample used for this study (who according to AAUP standards would have been considered for tenure) is limited to those who received their Ph.D. prior to 1968, since persons who finished degrees after that year are still on the promotion and tenure ladder. Of those persons surveyed, it is evident that the Kent Fellows were most successful, followed by the Danforth Fellows, the Woodrow Wilsons, and then the Near Misses. The Kent Fellows, one must be reminded, are slightly older and more experienced when they receive their Ph.D., which may account in part for their greater success.

Table XI

Tenure Rate of Pre-1968 Ph.D. Recipients

	Total Sample	Number Tenured	%
D	68	34	50
K	38	23	61
WW	42	15	36
NM	19	4	21

One can only speculate on reasons for these significant differences in tenure rate among top Fellowship competitors in the country. Some institutions of higher education clearly prefer those persons who have had an association with the Danforth Foundation. Responses from deans and presidents to questionnaires clearly indicate their awareness of Danforth Fellows on campus; that often they are "in the forefront of curricular innovation," are "leaders among faculty," and are "recognized as superb teachers."*

It is hard to indicate precisely whether the Danforth affiliation which encourages development of a life of scholarship and service is so effective, or if the selection procedures identify candidates with the ability to present themselves which provides a critical difference even ten or twelve years later. Responses from the sample suggest reassuringly that both factors are present.

Tenure and size of institution are not closely aligned, at least in our

*These and subsequent quotations are taken directly from responses from deans and college presidents to a letter sent them by the Danforth Foundation, from comments made by respondents in their questionnaires or interviews, and from statements by participants in the selection process (see Appendix A for letters sent).

sampling. Most tenured persons are in fact found in institutions of 1,000 enrollment and over.

Table XII

Tenure vs Size of Undergraduate Institution

% Tenured

	D	K	WW	NM
Under 1,000	8	6	7	20
1,000-5,000	36	28	26	33
5,000-10,000	15	19	23	7
10,000-20,000	23	19	17	13
Over 20,000	18	28	27	27

Educational Objectives

An individual's personal objectives unquestionably affect not only the manner of meeting those objectives but the outcomes. In this study we are particularly interested in those outcomes in the areas of conflict between stated objectives and commitment to institutional goals, resolution of such conflict, and overall commitment to teaching and institutional involvement.

In some initial statements of application for a Danforth Fellowship, candidates who became Fellows described their objectives as follows:

- For myself, I should prefer to teach students of the sciences and the other humanities than students of philosophy, because I am interested more in the use of my subject than in the

perpetration of an individual doctrine. (From a person involved in interdisciplinary teaching.)

- I am concerned with the problems of human communication. Communication can thrive only through an environment of love. Teaching, when it is both a profession and a vocation can epitomize an archetype of human communication in its highest degree of intensity.

- Education is one effective way for sound constructive participation in terms of both individual influence and general influence on the level and breadth of national awareness.

The Danforth Fellowships focus primarily on preparation for college teaching. A natural concern of this study, therefore, has been to try to determine if Danforth Fellows maintain their stated commitments once they are within an institution and if so, whether they find themselves in conflict with other institutional demands.

Two questions were asked relating directly to the themes of educational objectives and teaching commitment. The questionnaire asked what emphasis was given to particular objectives in undergraduate courses taught. Table XIII indicates the responses.

Table XIII

In undergraduate courses, how much emphasis do you personally give the following educational objectives?

Scale 1 = a great deal 4 = none

	D	K	WW	NM
Acquainting students with the methodology or general orientation of a discipline.	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9
Introducing the facts, seminal works, or other basic "hard" knowledge of an area.	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.1
Encouraging the development of basic communicative skills including written and oral self-expression.	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0
Fostering the development of independent research and scholarship skills.	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5
Encouraging personal self-definition and emotional growth.	2.7	2.4	2.9	2.8
Stressing rigorous thought or scholarly modes of reasoning.	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8
Encouraging curiosity or a long-term interest in an area by stressing unresolved problems, issues, and questions.	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.9
Acquainting students with the broader ethical or social concerns that relate to a body of knowledge.	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.2
Fostering critical self-reflection about personal or social values.	2.2	1.8	2.3	2.2
Stressing an interdisciplinary or synthesizing approach to intellectual questions which runs across the borders of recognized academic disciplines.	2.1	1.7	1.9	2.1

Any ranking of educational objectives is highly dependent upon the context; that is, the needs of students, the subject matter, the discipline and the institution. While the general ranking of this group of talented faculty is provocative, of particular interest to this study is the difference in weight given by the four groups.

The largest differences are found on six items: fostering development of independent research and scholarship skills, encouraging self definition and emotional growth, developing curiosity and long term interests, presenting broader ethical and social concerns, fostering self reflection about personal and social values, and stressing interdisciplinary synthesizing of intellectual questions. On each of these Kent Fellows ranked highest, or more accurately highest in five and tied for first on the other. Danforth Fellows ranked second or tied for first on five of the six. While the differences between former Kent and Danforth Fellows on the one hand and Woodrow Wilsons and Near Misses on the other are not large, the direction illustrates the strengths of the Fellowship program in selecting and preparing Fellows who direct students toward important values. And the differences remain consistent, verifying individual personal statements of Fellows. Further focusing on these educational objectives, the researchers asked questions relating to commitment to teaching, conflict between teaching and research, and about contributions both to the academic community and the larger community "out there."

It is important to know whether the original commitment to teaching has been maintained by determining how strong Danforth and Kents Fellows are as teachers. This information is difficult to ascertain, relying as it

does on the subjective judgments of individuals concerned. Nevertheless, we felt no reluctance in asking the sample to comment on their commitment to teaching, on the goals of their teaching, and on the values they attempt to transmit. When asked to compare their teaching style to other members of their department, the respondents ranked the components as follows:

Table XIV

Comparison of teaching style with colleagues

	Ranking			
Rank ordered from 1 to 6:				
1 = great importance 6 = least importance				
	D	K	WW	NM
Ability to communicate easily with undergraduates	1	1	1	1
Innovative or particularly effective teaching style	2	4	2	2
Concern with the broader ethical significance of field	3	2	6	5
Especially thorough understanding of field	4	5	3	3
Innovative course offerings	5	3	4	4
Especially rigorous approach to subject matter	6	6	5	6

It is noteworthy that everyone ranks ability to communicate easily with undergraduates first; of more particular interest is the fact that Kent and Danforth Fellows ranked concern for ethical significance in their teaching second and third as contrasted to NM and WW who ranked them

fifth and sixth. One Kent Fellow wrote: "The concern for ethical, social and religious values fostered by the Danforth/Kent experience helped me to become a teacher preeminently concerned with the existential problems of students and the way they choose to live in the world. Academia as a whole is not concerned with the value question. I still believe in the ideals developed through the Danforth and Kent experience even if I am a bit less optimistic."

From the interview data it appeared that Kent Fellows emphasized religious values in their teaching, a finding consistent with their particular orientation. The values of the Danforth Fellows were more likely to reflect a humanistic rather than a religious framework. For example, one Danforth Fellow's interest in teaching centers around the kind of direct influence the teacher has on the student's understanding of the ethical and social context in which information may be used. The values he expresses in his work are primarily humanistic and interpersonal, e.g., integrity and personal honesty. He finds himself attracted to teaching because he sees the role of a faculty member as more conducive to dealing with the ethical issues in science. It is somewhat puzzling to note that neither Kent nor Danforth Fellows rank a rigorous approach to subject matter in their teaching as a higher priority, since they are clearly concerned about their own scholarship and academic prowess.

One Fellow has been teaching in a law school for eight years and, more briefly, in an experimental undergraduate Residential College program for several years. He enjoys and is highly committed to teaching, and would like to have more time to teach undergraduate and interdisciplinary

courses. Currently, he teaches a course on law and society, an advanced seminar on the sociology of law which includes both law students and sociology graduate students. He also donates time for a monthly meeting with law students who are bored with the usual curriculum and want a more intellectual interdisciplinary venture where they can explore broader issues in the field. Not only does he like to teach and feel he learns a great deal from his students, but, encouragingly, he indicates the faculty is supportive of his interdisciplinary interests and research.

Another Fellow, having a great deal of contact with students, feels that his heavy commitment to teaching has gotten in the way of his scholarship, but he has the courage of his conviction to say that he thinks in the long run such attention to students and teaching will pay off. His chief characteristics, ones that are revealed in his academic and community life, are compassion, gregariousness, a great deal of love for other people, and dedication to what he is doing. He has never lost faith in the beauty and excitement of his field, and he manages to convey this to his students.

There are teachers in all groups who became more realistic over the years, as one Kent scholar reflected in his interview:

> L____. now sees teaching as the ideal spot from which to think through some issues and problems in one's field--less missionary intention to reform the world or change students and more awareness of the personal benefits though without neglect of course preparations or responsibilities to students.

Time and again the data attest that Danforth and Kent Fellows have continued to take seriously their commitment to teaching. This has raised the question of whether they have been able to maintain quality in their

research and scholarly interests, and what conflict if any they have encountered between teaching and research. The data explicitly show that Danforth and Kent Fellows have sustained active research records, but as one Kent Fellow put it in an interview, "I always look at what I have done in both teaching and scholarship." Table XV describes the sample's research interests.

Table XV

Research and scholarly interests are described by the following:

Scale: 1 = statement very well describes my research

5 = statement not at all describes my research

	D	K	WW	NM
Interests relate to widely recognized problems or issues	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9
Research interest lies outside dominant concerns of discipline	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.9
Ethical & social concerns are important motivation for work	2.0	1.6	2.3	2.1
Scholarship draws heavily on other disciplinary fields	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8

It appears that Kent scholars' interests are broader than those of other groups. (See next Table.)

Table XVI

Work published that was intended for an audience outside the academic community (percent of response)

	D	K	WW	NM
YES	38	60	39	37
NO	62	40	61	63

The extensive interests of Kent scholars are again in evidence here. Apparently, their writing has more often than others been directed toward non-academic audiences. There is other evidence to show that Danforth and Kent Fellows, while maintaining interests in teaching and institutional reforms, have pursued scholarly activities as well. Tables XVII, XVIII and XIX show that all Danforth Fellows have held their own in publication, and in some instances do better than the rest of the sample for this study.

Table XVII

Measures of Research & Scholarly Interests

Scale: 1 = lowest 5 = highest

Number of books or monographs published or edited, alone or in collaboration?

	Mean
D	1.9
K	2.0
WW	1.8
NM	1.8

Table XVIII

Total number of articles published in academic or professional journals?

	Mean
D	3.5
K	4.8
WW	3.5
NM	3.8

Table XIX

Number of professional writings published or accepted for publication in the last two years?

	Mean
D	3.6
K	3.8
WW	3.5
NM	3.8

Inevitably, when the subject of publications is raised, the issue of conflict between teaching and research also comes up, and so the question was asked.

Table XX

To extent that a conflict existed between teaching and research what form did it assume?

	Percent			
	D	K	WW	NM
No conflict experienced	22	16	16	14
Conflict between teaching and research or publication	49	56	46	56
Conflict with department over substance of course	4	5	1	1
Conflict over teaching method	6	7	4	0
Conflict over ethical, religious, political view	4	6	2	3
Conflict other	10	10	11	3

Clearly, the one major source of conflict the sample encountered was the ever present dilemma in academic life between research and teaching, a dilemma which is in a sense intensified by a fellowship program which designedly encourages both teaching and scholarship. Nevertheless, Danforths experienced less conflict between teaching and other activities than did members of the other groups. Similar evidence from the 1975 study indicates that the largest percentage of GFW Fellows also preferred a combination of research and teaching, with inclination toward teaching fostered by the type of undergraduate institution in which they taught.

Table XXI

To the extent that conflict existed how did you resolve it?

	D	K	WW	NM
Strongly in favor of teaching commitment	36	42	33	37
Slightly in favor of teaching commitment	21	33	33	33
Strongly in favor of other academic obligations	6	4	2	5
Slightly in favor of other academic obligations	12	8	12	9
No conflict experienced	25	13	20	16

It is the former Kent Fellows who feel the conflict and overwhelmingly resolve the dilemma by opting for teaching; in fact 75% choose this resolution. One Kent Fellow, when asked in an interview if any conflict existed between his research and teaching, replied, "I see no contradiction between teaching and research. My class is a laboratory for humanistic thought and action."

In another question we attempted to clarify this dilemma even further by seeking the basic interest these faculty members had in teaching and research.

Table XXII

Does your interest lie primarily in teaching or research?

	D	K	WW	NM
Very heavily in research	4	2	7	6
Very heavily in teaching	32	28	35	28
In both but leaning toward teaching	52	57	43	49
In both but leaning toward research	11	13	15	18

Kent and Danforth Fellows continue to express their strong interests in both teaching and research when they are forced to make a choice they opt for an emphasis on teaching. They, less often than Woodrow Wilson or Near Misses, choose the extreme categories of very heavy interest in either teaching or research; this continued balance of teaching and research is a hallmark of Foundation Fellowship recipients.

While the Danforth Foundation has emphasized a commitment to teaching in the Graduate Fellowship Program, in related conferences and other meetings it has promoted general concern for the academic community and for the larger community within which each person coexists. Throughout the years that conferences have been held, some major themes predominate. Typical of the topics on regional and national Fellowship conference programs between 1967 and 1973 are the following:

"University Governance and the University as a Political Institution." 1970

"The Nature of Political Obligation in a Nation at War." 1968

"Vocation and Community." 1973

"Teaching as Educating: Teaching beyond the Classroom." 1970

"The University and the Social Uses of Knowledge." 1970

"The University's Normative Role and Its Responsibility for Action." 1970

This study would be incomplete, therefore, without attempting to assess what additional contributions Fellows made to the academy and what their general involvement was in the larger community.

Respondents were asked what additional contributions they made to

educational process besides formal coursework and advising responsibilities. Danforth and Kent respondents overwhelmingly indicated substantial additional contributions (56% for Kent Fellows, 49% for Danforth Fellows and only 34% for Woodrow Wilson Fellows and 20% for Near Misses). Upon close examination of this data we find clear evidence that these contributions were in the curriculum areas within the institution, primarily with interdisciplinary curricula for the Kent Fellows, in teaching methods for both Kent and Danforth Fellows, in the area of course evaluation for Danforth Fellows, and in field of continuing education for Kent Fellows. It is apparent from the data that both Kent and Danforth Fellows were able to accommodate their personal and professional interests within the institutions on whose faculties they serve.

When asked about their favorite course, more Danforth and Kent recipients stated that it was in their primary field of specialization and to a great extent they were now teaching what they most wanted to teach. This information further confirms the prior statement that Danforth and Kent Fellows were able to accommodate both institutional demands and their own special concerns with equal success.

Fellows as Institutional Shapers

The role of Danforth and Kent Fellows in their institutions is obviously an important dimension of their professional and personal values. To evaluate these qualities we probed several points.

Table XXIII

Attitudes About Institution & Students

Scale: 1 = strongly agree 4 = strongly disagree

	D	K	WW	NM
A person can be an effective teacher without personally involving oneself with students	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.9
This institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems	2.3	2.1	2.4	2.3
More minority group undergraduates should be admitted here even if it means relaxing academic standards	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.6
Most American colleges reward conformity and penalize creativity	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.4
The undergraduate curriculum has suffered from the over-specialization of faculty members	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.6
This institution should be concerned with students' values as part of their intellectual development	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.5

Several of these items were suggested by the Martin Trow study, about which more will be said later. On five out of six items Kent Fellows ranked strongest in agreement, while Danforth holders were second or tied for second in five of the six. The differences are small but the pattern is consistent with a humanistic position.

A closely related area has to do with attitudes toward the individual's institutional role and degree of personal involvement. Questions were asked pertaining to advocacy of reform as well as the extent to which the

respondent felt he or she had influenced institutional and/or departmental policies. Because the role of a faculty member may be significantly affected by position, the data were analyzed first on the basis of the general response, then in terms of tenured and non-tenured positions. Part-time and non-tenure track appointments were omitted because their influence on policy is generally small.

Table XXIV

Have been a strong advocate of institutional reform on own campus.

	Percent of Total Sample Indicating "Yes"
D	44
K	56
WW	45
NM	31

Table XXV

Have been a strong advocate of particular instructional reforms, innovations, etc. within own department.

	Percent of Total Sample Indicating "Yes"
D	62
K	68
WW	65
NM	50

Kent Fellows indicated a more frequent position of advocacy at both institutional and departmental levels than did the others. However, the picture changes slightly when analyzed in terms of tenure:

Table XXVI

Have been a strong advocate of institutional reform on own campus.

	% Yes			
	D	K	WW	NM
Tenured	58	63	69	42
Non-tenured	38	44	31	26

Non-tenured former Danforth and Kent holders appear to have expressed an above average advocacy for institutional reform. Among the tenured faculty, Woodrow Wilson Fellows were particularly involved in aspects of institutional reform, with Kent and Danforth Fellows following closely behind. When the focus is shifted from advocacy to action and perceptions of the efficacy of such action, we see the picture below.

Table XXVII

How active are you in department affairs?

	% Response			
	D	K	WW	NM
Category Chosen: Much more than average				
Tenured	54	53	33	60
Non-tenured	16	26	33	33

Table XXVIII

How active are you in faculty governance of your institution?

	D	K	WW	NM
Category Chosen: Much more than average				
Tenured	33	40	27	40
Non-tenured	16	19	21	19

Table XXIX

How much opportunity do you feel you have to influence the policies of your department?

	D	K	WW	NM
Category Chosen: A great deal				
	% Response			
Tenured	56	58	50	53
Non-tenured	32	39	25	52

Table XXX

How much opportunity do you feel you have to influence the policies of your institution?

	D	K	WW	NM
Category Chosen: A great deal				
	% Response			
Tenured	22	26	13	13
Non-tenured	7	11	6	4

It is not surprising that the statistical differences in these areas are not greatly different among the four groups, since their talents and interests are so similar. Nevertheless, while Danforth and Kent Fellows were not as active as Woodrow Wilsons or Near Misses in the institution, they felt that they were influential in shaping both departmental and institutional policies. Upon further analysis it is clear that in the area of institutional and instructional reform, Danforth and Kent Fellows indicate heavy involvement (56% for Kent Fellows, 44% for Danforth Fellows, 45% for Woodrow Wilson Fellows and only 31% for Near Misses). The areas of most intense involvement and concern were curricular reform, student-faculty relations, and particularly for Kent Fellows a high degree of interdisciplinary and teaching reform.

The non-quantifiable data, specifically the comments received from deans and university presidents, indicate that Danforth Fellows are "more involved in curricular reform than their peers," are conscientious about teaching," and "are identified with changes in courses and institutional reforms." One dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at a well known Eastern university summed up the position of Danforth Fellows thusly: "They can certainly be placed in the category of campus leaders." The provost of a respected midwestern university stated that "eight of the nine [Danforth and Kent Fellows teaching in this institution] are known to me because they are outstanding university citizens who do more than most people do for the institution and hence are visible." Similar comments substantiate the impression that the objectives of the Foundation's Fellowship Program are being realized.

The role of students in policy determinations at both the graduate and undergraduate levels was a major issue throughout the years covered by this study. Our data indicate that Danforth and Kent Fellows consistently favored student participation in governance and policy deliberations slightly more than Woodrow Wilson Fellows. Except on matters of their own discipline, however, our sample reflects general conservatism toward the role of students in academic decision making.

Table XXXI

Role undergraduates should play in following areas:

Scale: 1 = voting majority 5 = no role

	D	K	WW	NM
Faculty appointment and promotion	3.1	3.1	3.5	(Not asked)
Undergraduate admissions policy	3.1	3.1	3.3	
Structure & scheduling of courses	2.9	2.8	3.0	
Student discipline	1.9	2.0	2.0	
Bachelor's degree requirements	3.2	3.0	3.3	

Table XXXII

Role graduate students should play in the following decisions.

Scale: 1 = voting majority 5 = no role

	D	K	WW	NM
Faculty appointment and promotion	2.9	2.7	3.1	(Not asked)
Departmental graduate admissions policy	2.9	2.8	3.2	
Provision and content of graduate courses	2.6	2.5	2.8	
Student discipline	2.0	2.0	2.1	
Advanced degree requirements	2.9	2.8	3.0	

Off-Campus Activities

The Danforth Foundation has always emphasized service to community, the hope being that Fellows would live their values as well as describe them. The complete citizen finds opportunities to participate in organizations beyond the campus, professional and otherwise. The evidence indicates that Kent Fellows became much more fully involved in professional organizations, thus expanding their educational commitment and opportunities for leadership. Almost one half of the Kent Fellows have held positions of leadership in these organizations, a mark of serious engagement as well as peer recognition.

Table XXXIII

Number of professional organizations in which membership is held

	Mean
D	2.7
K	3.4
WW	3.0
NM	2.9

Table XXXIV

Leadership in professional organization as evidenced by holding of a position

	Percent
D	27
K	48
WW	28
NM	24

Again, the prominence of the Kent Fellows may be a factor of their age, since five years can make a great difference in academic development and achievement. Nevertheless, that nearly fifty percent of the Kents held positions of leadership in professional societies is quite remarkable.

In the area of non-professional community activities, we have a wide ranging picture, and it is not disappointing.

Table XXXV

Participation in non-professional organizations during the last two years.

	Percent			
	D	K	WW	NM
Social Service Agency	13	19	6	(Not asked)
Church or synagogue	44	53	34	
Local schools	25	26	15	
Political organization	28	38	16	
City planning or development	7	9	4	
Alumni-alumnae relations	12	10	11	
Environmental protection	15	16	17	

On five of the seven items Kent Fellows were the most active, on one the Danforth scholars ranked first, and on five others they ranked second. The general level of participation in a wide variety of community activities by former Fellows is high by most standards. Along with the comments of Fellows as to their overall commitment to the community at large, the data attest to their euqanimity and concern in times of difficulty and stress.

NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

The great majority of former Fellows remain in academic positions: 82% of Danforths, 92% of Kents, and 79% of Woodrow Wilsons. While there are no available data to compare with these figures on a national basis, since studies of attrition in the academic profession have yet to be made, we find them generally gratifying. Unfortunately, whereas in the past the

decision to abandon college teaching as a career was likely to be voluntary and influenced by many variables; more recently the pressures of the academic marketplace have drastically changed the circumstances. Now people are finding access to academic appointments greatly diminished or even non-existent; what the impact will be of the declining job market on former and current Fellows should be the subject of another study in the near future.

For the purposes of this study, we wanted to know what happened to former Danforth and Kent Fellows who have chosen non-academic careers. As might be expected, there is a considerable variety to the areas of employment, with research and development most common, government and social service agencies following closely behind.

Table XXXVI

Current Employment in Non-Academic Occupations

(Percentages of Number of Each Group)

	D	K	WW	NM
Industrial Production	8	17	29	0
Research and Development	42	33	36	67
Government	27	33	21	0
Social Agency	11	17	14	0
Church	8	0	0	33
Public Office	4	0	0	0

When asked if they utilize their graduate education in their present positions former Kent Fellows indicated that they used their training

extensively, with Danforth Fellows a close second.

Interestingly enough, former Fellows seem to stress the essential values and ideals inherent in the Danforth Fellowships in the lives they currently lead. The figures for persons in academic and non-academic positions are as follows:

Table XXXVII

Participation in non-professional organizations during the last two years (Percentages)

		Non-Academic	Academic
Social Service Agency	D	24	13
	K	40	9
	WW	15	6
Church or Synagogue	D	43	44
	K	30	53
	WW	27	34
Local Schools	D	30	25
	K	40	26
	WW	19	15
Political Organizations	D	32	28
	K	20	38
	WW	15	16
Environmental Protection	D	24	15
	K	10	16
	WW	15	17

The majority of Kent and Danforth Fellows currently employed in non-academic positions stated they planned to return to academic employment in the future. Whatever their calling, however, the values manifested during their years as graduate students have apparently stayed with persons in the vocations they pursued.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Earlier in this report, mention was made of the fact that data were collected to provide comparative findings on both the processes and outcomes of graduate study on Danforth and Kent Fellows, Woodrow Wilson and Near Miss persons. We also wanted to see how this entire select group of distinguished graduates would, in addition, stand a test of comparison on a national sample from Martin Trow's extensive study Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education, a study of attitudes of students and faculty members in the 'sixties. Although there are some discernible differences among the four groups of fellowship holders, the similarities in many instances are greater than the disparities. This is understandable since this group of fellowship holders represents the same pool of talent with differences mainly in personal interests and value orientation, not necessarily in terms of ability.

However, when this sample was compared with a national sample of faculty persons in higher education, some major discrepancies were evident. The national sample of faculty and graduate students paled on issues similar to the concerns for this assessment. The information from the Trow study provides an interesting context for the Danforth/Kent Review, although its use does not necessarily express agreement with all of the Trow findings.

The Trow data have been organized into seven categories according to the prestige of the institution (as determined by Trow) with which the faculty member was associated. There were three prestige categories of universities--high, medium, low; three prestige categories of four-year

colleges--high, medium, low; junior colleges which were not differentiated, plus a weighted national average. Some overall information on the Trow findings is applicable to the Danforth-Kent assessment. These data set parameters for some of the comparisons to be made. The following suggest the framework of the analyses.

1) The number of hours of classroom teaching each week averaged 9.0 and ranged from a low of 5.4 in the high-prestige universities to a high of 13.4 in the junior colleges. There was an increase in every category along the way; the more prestige of the university or college, the less time faculty spent in formal classroom instruction.
2) Faculty members in the more prestigious universities had fewer students enrolled in their classes than those in the less prestigious colleges. Forty percent of the highest prestige university faculty members had a total enrollment of less than twenty-five students as compared with 12% in junior colleges.
3) Faculty teaching responsibilities confined to undergraduates ranged from 17% in the high-prestige schools to 99% in the junior colleges.
4) Of the faculty members in the high-prestige universities, 50% indicated that their interests lie primarily in research while that was true of only 5% in the junior colleges.
5) Faculty members in the highest prestige universities had published more (79% had written at least one article in the last two years) than those from low-prestige institutions (where only 13% had published in the last two years).

In each of these five analyses, the response pattern consistently reflected each step on the seven-point prestige scale. Such a consistency is very unusual and illustrates the effect of institutional prestige on the environment for teaching and research.

Previous data presented indicated that of our sample Kent Fellows published most in academic or professional journals, that both Kent and Danforth Fellows published the most books or monographs, and Kents tied with Near Misses for the largest number of professional writings published or accepted for publication in the last two years. If we compare this information to the Trow data table, it is evident that Danforth and Kent Fellows rank overall with faculty from medium-prestige universities, the second on the seven-point scale. On a national level, this indicates a commendable publishing record, particularly in the light of the additional roles Danforth and Kent Fellows take in their institutions.

Table XXXVIII

National Sample (Trow)

Percent of sample

Number of Articles Published	University			Four-Year			Jr	All	Danforth Sample			
	Hi	Med	Low	Hi	Med	Low			D	K	WW	NM
0	21	29	42	47	63	73	87	53	28	20	34	22
1-4	52	51	47	44	33	25	12	36	60	68	53	61
5+	27	20	11	9	4	2	1	11	12	12	13	17

If we juxtapose research against the teaching, we find some very striking findings. Table 37 indicates teaching commitments for our sample compared to expected teaching commitments for the national sample.

Table XXXIX

Hours per week classroom teaching (mean) - (Trow and Danforth)

University			Four-Year			Jr.	All	Danforth			
Hi	Med	Low	Hi	Med	Low			D	K	WW	NM
5.4	6.4	7.9	8.1	10.3	10.9	13.4	9.4	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.4

The number of hours which should be spent in formal class instruction has frequently been a point of controversy between faculty and administration, between unions and legislators. The Trow data are especially useful here, for they dramatically illustrate how teaching hours vary from institution to institution. Trow, incidentally, comments on the fact that it is difficult to correlate between the number of classroom hours and teaching effectiveness.

Woodrow Wilsons and Near Misses on the average teach more than Danforth and Kent Fellows; however, the differences are not significant. If we juxtapose these items against the Trow distribution, we see that 8.2 or 8.4 hours a week is comparable to the teaching load of faculty members in high-prestige four year colleges. Thus, we can draw the conclusion that not only are Danforth and Kent Fellows producing scholarly works comparable to faculty of medium-prestige institutions, but they are also carrying heavier teaching loads than faculty in those institutions.

There are two additional indices on teaching load for which Trow data are available:

Table XL

Sum total of all students at all levels enrolled in your courses this term (% under 25) - (Trow and Danforth)

University			Four-Year			Jr.	All	Danforth			
Hi	Med	Low	Hi	Med	Low			D	K	WW	NM
40	3-	22	22	15	16	12	22	21	19	17	16

Again, the sample for the Dan[illegible]'s assessment and in particular the Kent and Danforth Fellows exhibit a teaching load commensurate with those persons from prestigious four-year colleges. These data indeed indicate the success of Danforth Fellows on the dimensions emphasized by the Foundation.

As Table XLI on page 61 shows, the Kent and Danforth Fellows are strong advocates of student participation in university governance and policy making. While the attitudes among all the Fellowship holders were not markedly different, they show a healthy discrepancy from the norm, particularly in comparison to a national sample. The Danforth and Kent Fellows also consistently express a greater interest in graduate and undergraduate student participation in governance than did the Woodrow Wilson Fellows.

In a set of items common with the Trow data on the attitudes about the role graduate and undergraduate students should play in the decision process, the contrasts between the national sample and the Danforth sample were dramatic. There was a small but consistent tendency for the faculty of more-prestigious institutions to favor student participation in decisions more than those at less-prestigious institutions. However,

there is a sharp contrast between the openness toward student participation of the former Danforth and Kent Fellows and narrower non-participatory attitudes among faculty members generally. Even the Woodrow Wilsons, who are the most conservative of the groups in the Danforth sample, are open and permissive by comparison with the Trow national sample of faculty members. Interestingly enough, the graduate students in the Trow sample were virtually as conservative as faculty members.

One example will make the point:

Table XLI

The Percentage of Those Who Would Allow Little or No Role for Undergraduates in Faculty ppointments - (Trow and Danforth)

	University			College			Jr. College	Weighted Average
	H	M	L	H	M	L		
National Sample of Faculty	51	55	54	49	53	53	60	54
National Sample of Graduate Students	32	42	46	46	47	52	--	44
D	11							
K	5							
WW	18							

A majority of the national faculty sample (54%) see little or no role for undergraduates in faculty appointments, while 89% of the Danforth and 95% of the Kent Fellows see them having an active role in the process.

With respect to their feeling about the climate for creativity among students, Danforth and Kent Fellows feel that most American colleges reward conformity and penalize creativity more than do faculty members at large universities.

Table XLII

	Hi Prestige Uni Faculty	Junior College Faculty	Weighted Average	D	K
% Agreeing	49	52	51	64	64

Perhaps the most puzzling response indicated that as a group Danforth and Kent Fellows do not subscribe to teaching effectiveness as the primary criterion for promotion. In view of their comparatively full teaching loads and clear commitment to teaching, we can only surmise that the Fellows prefer to live their teaching commitment rather than merely to give lip service.

Table XLIII

Teaching effectiveness not publication should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty - (Trow and Danforth)

	University			College			Junior College	Weighted Average
	H	M	L	H	M	L		
% Agreeing	51	62	74	75	88	90	96	77
Danforth	49%							
Kent	59%							

There is an inverse relationship between institutional prestige and percent who believe primary weight should be given teaching in promotion.

Danforth and Kent Fellows agree with faculty at high-prestige universities in their comparative lack of support for teaching as a primary criterion for promotion. Their own interest in teaching is in sharp contrast to this relatively small weight they would give it in promotion.

It is evident that the Fellowship study sample, and in most instances specifically the Danforth and Kent Fellows, have indicated in several vital areas of concern to higher education a real commitment to scholarship and teaching in combination with the values underlying the Danforth Fellowship Program. The contrast with the Trow sample effectively substantiates the findings that Fellowship holders characteristically take active roles in institutions of higher education in the areas of teaching and scholarship as well as in the additional areas of community responsibility, largely defined. On the whole, the record is one of notable success and continued commitment in a period when the academic community was undergoing its most difficult trial in recent memory. Of that, more later.

VI. The Danforth Experience

"The Danforth Foundation has given more than money; it has given--through its staff and programs--personal encouragement, a sense of direction in graduate work, and a strong sense of belonging to something larger than one's own discipline. My perspectives were always being broadened by my Danforth contacts." This comment by a 1960 Danforth Fellow epitomizes the responses to questions asking if Danforth and Kent Fellowships were different from other fellowships. The overwhelming

majority (95%) stated there was a significant difference, noting such areas as personal concern (28%), humane approach to other persons (28%) the sense of community (25%), and in the generosity and flexibility of the financial support (21%).

Fellowships also provided some free time, one of life's more precious commodities, and in a very real sense Fellows gained a freedom to choose work that was rewarding. Fellows did not have to find additional employment to finance graduate school but could concentrate on the total academic experience. At the outset, Danforth Fellows ranked commitment to teaching higher than Kents, perhaps understandably as a group more recently entered the professional reaches of the academic world.

It should be clear that each item, regardless of ranking, is interrelated with the purposes which the community of Fellows was designed to serve, e.g., develop a commitment to teaching, provide a stimulus to graduate study, stimulate personal growth and encourage students outside of their own discipline--essentially a list of activities for the fellowship of the Fellowship. Nevertheless, the rankings reveal an essential ordering, one which represents the spirit of the Foundation.

Personal comments from Fellows substantiate these observations. One Fellow wrote:

> Being a Danforth Fellow connotes multiple meanings for me, although to me that diversity of associations is contrasted by the uniqueness of commitment by the Foundation and its staff to the Fellow and the underlying humanistic principles of college education. The Danforth network because of its intensity of purpose and its devotion to nascent scholar teachers has bequeathed a highly individualized legacy which each fellow inherently propagates in his or her own way.

Another Fellow wrote: "Fellows are intelligent people and are working constantly to put together a coherent and more comprehensive world-view, along with a coherent system of values. The Foundation with its activities has helped greatly to foster the contribution to superior teachers and human beings."

Experience is an illusory phenomenon, perhaps best defined as conscious events that make up an individual's life. In assessing the impact of any program upon individuals over a period of time, one had best examine the dimensions of that activity and the nature and breadth of the experiences of the many persons involved.

The Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program comprises an abundance of differing dimensions, many of which may be difficult to capture fully in a report such as this. They are nevertheless vital components of the total Fellowship in its dual meaning. This review has discussed the origins and nature of the fellowship program; its attempt to prepare individuals for a life in academe; its endeavors to make an impact on values and its hopes of affecting and improving the humane elements in individual lives. While these impacts are difficult to measure statistically, there is sufficient evidence that the Fellowship Program has made lasting contributions toward these goals.

As we heard from Advisory Council members, interviewers, readers, resource persons and college administrators about the effects of the Danforth Fellowship Program, we discerned several predominant themes: 1) personal attention has a profound effect over time, not only in how the individual is treated, but how that individual as a result of this

treatment reacts toward others; 2) the development and continuation of a reference group helps to keep the larger goals in perspective; 3) there has been a continual challenge toward excellence in many areas; 4) the ability to blend heterogeneity and commonality surfaces when Fellows get together. Each theme has been addressed repeatedly by persons involved in the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program.

The Danforth experience embraces young persons in or about to enter graduate school, professors and administrators who are advisors and consultants at Foundation-sponsored conferences, junior and senior faculty and others from all over the country who have been readers, interviewers, and Advisory Council members. In their own way, through untold hours of reading or interviewing time, through their willingness to serve wherever possible in any capacity needed, and through their solid commitment to values espoused by the Foundation, these people have attested to the "scientifically unmeasurable" but nonetheless profoundly humane qualities perpetuated through Foundation activities and by Foundation personnel and Trustees.

This report has mentioned that 95% of the Fellows believed their fellowship experience was different from others and made a difference in their lives, especially in the personal domain and in the sense of community it created, nurtured and developed. Fellows' reactions to the conferences attest to their commitment to the ideals of the Foundation. At a recent final-year conference, one Fellow said:

> I think the conferences are one of the two most valuable things about having a Danforth Fellowship; the other factor is the trust the Foundation has in its Fellows that allows them latitude in finding their own way. Each conference

> has been extremely productive for me. They provide new ideas and valuable information; they affect my ideas about what is valuable in life and also affect, fairly directly, my ideas about education, for the point of education is to make people more human, to educate them for living valuable lives.

Another Fellow emphatically stated, "At the conference a whole new world opens itself before me. I come from the hard and alien academic world which exhausts me. At the conference the people are intelligent, eager and interested--still searching and still alive. These conferences restore my will to live. One receives a transfusion of life from the very presence of other interested and alive people." Still another Fellow stated that the conferences gave her the "opportunity to communicate with a group of persons whom I felt to be genuinely my peers--in interests, problems, and intensities."

Over and over Fellows comment on the "enduring friendships," the "fellowship of the participants," the "interrelationship of Fellows and resource persons," and "the opportunity to meet Fellows who will be future leaders in the academic world." One Fellow merely said, "Thank you for one of the highlights of my intellectual life." Lastly, one Fellow wrote to say:

> The Danforth Foundation is to be commended for seeing the need for, and then creating a genuine sense of 'fellowship'. Among academics (and future academics) there is an enormous need for this kind of exploration of ethical, moral and practical shared concerns and for the sense of community which accompanied it. I can only assume that the lives of students chosen who have had the opportunity to share this experience,

> are altered in profound ways. These students do not go unthinking into their profession. Their chances will be better thought out, better supported by their own developing ethical system.

These sentiments were also substantiated by participants in the Graduate Fellowships for Women. Comments from the 1975 study expressed these sentiments:

> The Foundation should be praised for having the most enlightened fellowship program of them all. The guarantee of support through to a degree frees the student to explore his/her intellectual limits without anxiety over financing the next year's work.
>
> The Fellowship has been my greatest opportunity. I cannot overstress its importance. As a woman, and also a woman returning to academic life after an interval of years, the humane, farsighted values which Danforth reflects by establishing such a program are rare and very much needed. I urge you to continue the GFW program.

While these data are not substantiated empirically, they certainly indicate that Fellows have been affected by the "fellowship of the Fellowships," and thus in turn may be expected to affect those they come in contact with in the future in much the same way.

The Fellowships are intended for graduate students, but there are many other persons profoundly affected by Fellowship activities. Readers interviewers, and Advisory Council members have commented in detail on the personal impact of their experience with the Danforth Foundation. Their association with the Foundation in itself has been a source of continuing strength to them, as witness these comments: "The Foundation has strengthened and broadened my own ethical and moral connections." "It has also had much to do with my unwavering concern for the student and teaching." One Advisory Council member simply stated, "The

Danforth/Kent Program is one of the genuine highlights of my life in the university world."

Advisory Council members have strongly supported the role of the Foundation in identifying persons who take leadership positions in the higher education arena. These persons feel that

> Fellows are superior human beings who have high regard for their fellow human beings and who also participate actively in the life of the academic community.

One Council member said that he finds in Danforth Fellows "a high degree of commitment to teaching along with a genuine concern for their students and colleagues. On a number of campuses former Danforth and Kent Fellows are really the heart not only of the academic enterprise, but of those forces in the college which make for humane education." Certainly these perceptions attest to the Foundation's ability to attract people who embody its own standards, while also indicating their awareness that it cares about the persons it supports.

As another tangent to this study, the Foundation solicited reactions to the impact of these fellowships in higher education. Again the responses were indicative of a worthy and deep influence over time. Here are some quotations, not at all atypical:

> The Danforth/Kent Fellowships, either by their selection of individuals or by the impact of the Fellowships on them, certainly have produced for us a talented group of faculty, particularly devoted to students, to teaching, and activity in educational innovations.

> The Danforth/Kent fellowships are important nationally and have exerted a significant effect on the quality of higher education in this country over many years.

> The Danforth/Kent programs fortunately are not addressed to manpower needs but rather to the qualities of teacher-scholar and to the promotion of certain kinds of teacher scholars.

And we see the commitment from persons associated with the Foundation in this statement: "My involvement in the DF program has been important in preventing me from slipping into an early complacency about higher education and about my own teaching."

We can even assume some responsibility for affecting intellectual changes on campuses. One respondent said, "I have been drawn into the social sciences and the physical and the biological sciences much more deeply through my work with Fellows," while another wrote: "I find that Fellows have introduced a range of issues in local colloquia about the fate of liberal arts in current higher education and the intensity of concern reflected the objectives underlying the Fellowship Program." Lastly, we note a telling comment from the dean of a major Southern institution. She writes, "The DF/Kent program is not just another program to support teachers. I believe it has nurtured a group of people in this country who have held and continue to hold a critical place in helping to make academia a more humane and ethical place."

Any assessment involves information and data from a multitude of sources, much of it statistically significant. However, that in itself does not always attest to its importance. There is a body of data, less quantifiable but no less truly representative of reality, that must bear witness if the total picture is to be comprehended. The observations, judgments, and conclusions of the many participants in this study comprise that data. They are valid measures of outcomes and need to be considered in the context of this assessment of the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program. To ignore them in the determination of future policy would be to deny something vital to the survival of the very values the Foundation strives to promote.

VII. The Fellowship Concept in a Changing Context

The Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program began almost at the point when American higher education entered a period of growth and development unprecedented and unmatched in the history of this or any other nation. In its earlier days the United States had believed in and acted on a simple and abiding faith in its own territorial "Manifest Destiny." So it seemed to believe and act during the 1950's and 1960's in the realm of higher education.

Historically the American people have looked to education as the major medium for social advancement and public improvement. That they have not always been generous in providing financial support in no way diminishes the fact of their faith, but during the 'fifties and especially the 'sixties even that charge could not be made. State and Federal governments poured billions of dollars into educational development, particularly at the higher level. State-wide systems of higher education appeared where before even state colleges were scarce, and former normal schools were instantly transformed into universities, at least in name. Graduate education burgeoned, too, and within a decade the number of doctoral degrees awarded nationally rose from 10,000 in 1960 to 30,000 by 1969.[9]

Foundations greatly increased their graduate fellowship programs and started new ones, while Congress began treating education like a wing of the Pentagon. Indeed, it was the National Defense Education Act under which much of the initial funding was justified, although it went under other guises of the national interest as further enactments were made through the 'sixties and early 'seventies. We have already seen how

mercurial much of this activity was (see p. 1), and with few exceptions it was almost as chaotic. Few people had the foresight or else the courage to raise at least some basic questions about the purpose or direction of what was happening.

So size, quantity, and numbers became the keystones of higher educational development in many quarters, to an extent in some places that students and often faculty began to feel left out. As the 'sixties wore on, the social tensions of a nation divided still by racial conflict were further exacerbated by a divisive war which few seemed to want and fewer knew how to end. And suddenly campuses became battlegrounds, not of ideas but literally of bombs and bullets. In truth, the number of institutions where violence occurred was small, but few colleges or universities were totally unaffected by the trauma and its aftermath.

There is little need to recount the period of upheaval which hit the higher academic community at the end of the 'sixties and continued through the early 'seventies. Neither are we able yet to account for all the causes, although the sense of alienation induced by sheer institutional size and numbers and the frustration fostered by national involvement in an increasingly senseless war are certainly among them.

Regardless of the causes, the nation became uneasy about restless and riotous students, and in general the position of higher education and its colleges and universities fell from public favor. The trend to reduce public expenditures for higher education began in the early 'seventies, and when in 1973 recession deepened into the country's most serious economic crisis in forty years, the axe fell quickly in Congress and in the legislatures of most of the fifty states. Now higher education is on the

defensive, neither a natural nor a necessary posture, but one for the moment it seems curiously unable to alter.

The present paralysis undoubtedly stems from the multiple shocks of the past half decade. Traditions of long standing were seriously shaken where they were not destroyed, and social patterns which had characterized campuses for most of this century were radically altered. Courses and curricula, credits and requirements, grades and records, indeed the whole apparatus of the academy was challenged, and parts at least were modified when they were not discarded. A new vocabulary for higher education is still evolving, with terms like nontraditional, experiential learning, open university, collective bargaining, and many others being widely used before they are well defined. Even the meaning of higher education itself is under question, and educators are foolishly falling for the old hassle about whether collegiate education should be preparation for life or merely for work.

As though the internal problems were not enough, the demands of state and federal agencies for compliance with a multitude of complex and occasionally contradictory regulations have seriously emburdened colleges and universities. Somewhere along the way, ironically after the funding had peaked, the idea of planning and master-planning took hold, and in a growing number of states <u>all</u> institutions offering post-high school education are being required to analyze their programs and resources in the light of state needs and revenues. The <u>all</u> is stressed because it means precisely that. Private colleges and universities with rare exceptions, including church- and formerly church-related institutions, are paying the same pipers as public institutions for government subsidies, no matter

how indirect. Yet even without the intervention of octopodous Federal agencies and the spreading ubiquity of state coordinating boards, institutions of higher education had begun to recognize the need to rationalize their operations.

As could be expected, there are ready purveyors of instant prescriptions, oblivious to or otherwise ignoring the danger that their medicine could perpetuate rather than cure the paralysis. Legislators are prone to advocate simplistic formulas, adopting the terminology of defense contracts to measure the productivity and cost-effectiveness of the classroom without regard to the differences between the honing of minds and machines. Economic laws of supply and demand are proposed to control educational policies in ways they no longer do in commerce. And as if to underscore its present plight, even among educators education is being discussed in terms of its immediate utility, that being no more and no less than the access it guarantees to paying jobs.

If the foregoing sounds like a rehearsal for the apocalypse, it is not so intended. The fact of the moment is undeniable: education, especially higher education, is experiencing a time of troubles. Yet to say that the picture is totally bleak would be wrong and misleading, for there are some sanguine signs.

Colleges and universities are looking at themselves with increasing intensity, reexamining their missions and struggling to allocate their resources with some sense of priority. Voices are beginning to speak out about the values of education beyond making a living, though they are not yet being heard very widely. Alternative approaches to teaching and learning are gradually being accepted where once they were not even countenanced,

and interdisciplinary programs are now found at the graduate level whereas not long ago they were uncommon even at the undergraduate level. There is currently a great deal of soul-searching within the academic community, and it has encompassed professional societies as well as the trustees of private institutions and central offices of statewide systems. The words of William D. Schaefer, Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association, are indicative:

> I think it is fair to say that if the panic and even, in some cases, the despair of the past three or four years has subsided, there was by no means an attitude of complacency or a feeling of return to "business as usual". on the part of the participants of the Austin conference. On the contrary, there were numerous expressions of deep concern as regards where we have been and where we are headed, and one [hears] a good deal about redefining basic issues and basic obligations.[10]

In his provocative analysis of civilization, Arnold Toynbee concluded that the quality and substance of a nation's response to the challenges of the times ultimately determined its success. There is much to ponder in Toynbee's thesis, as much for the future of higher education as for the nation.

In the light of the contemporary crisis, it takes little imagination to perceive that the context in which the Danforth Graduate Fellowships began in the early fifties has been profoundly altered by the tumultuous history of the past quarter century. In an era of shrinking finances long-standing assumptions are under challenge, and the immediate and often expedient tendency is to cut what may seem in the heat of the moment to be extraneous. Some are already clamoring to close graduate schools, or at least to limit their enrollments and cut back their programs. Ultimately, such steps may be necessary, but they should be preceded only by the most

careful and complete study of their ramifications.

Fortunately, thoughtful attention is being given to these issues. Recent reports by the National Board on Graduate Education[11] and the Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education[12] are cogently reasoned statements on the current situation and the prospects of graduate education. Each report finds much to criticize in the structure and pattern of graduate education in the United States. As the report of the Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education frankly states:

> Institutions awarding graduate degrees in the United States differ widely in function, but the meaning and value of this diversity remain obscure both inside and outside the academy. The opinion persists that a single standard, namely the quality of doctoral and postdoctoral research, is appropriate for the evaluation of the 307 graduate degree-granting schools which are currently members of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. Institutional behavior itself not infrequently reflects this delusion. Graduate programs with an orientation to teaching and to fulfilling the needs of regional or local student populations nevertheless can be pulled from their course by the influence of the major, national, comprehensive university programs. Equally harmful, diversity within the comprehensive universities themselves is inhibited by fear that evaluators will react negatively if they find deviations from the traditional norms of curricula, research, and the like. The possibility for cooperative relationships among any two graduate institutions performing different work is reduced because neither is likely to have a realistic understanding of the other's problems or proper goals.
>
> The "problem of mission" only begins here. Its ramifications and implications extend beyond the uses of diversity. They touch not only the survival of graduate education but the future of several kinds of academic excellence as well. As we all know, steps are being taken now, at a variety of levels, to phase out graduate programs which, viewed from regional or other extra-institutional perspectives, appear redundant, and such actions have inhibited institutional powers of self-determination. But at the moment the severest threats lie in obliviousness to the need for earnest, objective self-scrutiny aimed at setting reasonable institutional goals in a regional context.[13]

The challenge has thus been thrust before the nation's graduate schools; the quality and substance of their responses will clearly be crucial.

Not surprisingly, and despite the precipitous decline in Federal support for graduate education, the national government continues to maintain high interest in the subject. The Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education (FICE), in a report on "Federal Policy and Graduate Education" issued in June 1975, included this statement:

> America's graduate education and research establishment is a national resource. Furthermore, America's capacity to respond to changing societal needs, both culturally and technologically, depends upon the maintenance of the talent pool in intellectual, scientific, and human service areas.[14]

The report went on to say:

> ... the Federal government has two primary responsibilities with respect to graduate education. First, it has the responsibility to assure availability of sufficient manpower and knowledge resources to meet specific areas of national need. Secondly, it has the responsibility to assure that an optimum pool of qualified talent exists in all areas of knowledge essential to the long-term cultural and practical requirements of the nation.[15]

Unfortunately, there is invariably a lag between the perception of a national need and the political response to meet it. Nevertheless, it is encouraging merely to have such statements issued on behalf of all the Federal government agencies concerned with higher education.

There is no pretense that a private philanthropic foundation could begin to supplant or compete with the Federal government in support of all the necessary endeavors of higher education. At the same time, that neither disqualifies nor should diminish private efforts to bring to bear their own particular contributions to the quality and success of certain of those endeavors.

The Danforth Foundation consciously chose as its vehicle for contributing to the nation's higher educational resources a graduate fellowship program. This study has addressed itself to an evaluation of that program, both in terms of its contributions to higher education and society's needs, as well as to its effects on the lives of individuals. The research data, particularly when seen in the light of contemporary problems, indicate more than ever the need for a program of the character and quality of the Danforth Graduate Fellowships. Our study is persuasive that the Foundation has done and is doing its chosen task well. Others share this view. In an article in the April 1976 issue of Change Magazine, "Thoughts on the Graduate Experience," David Riesman notes that "The forms by which graduate education is financed make a tremendous difference in encouraging or discouraging students."[16] Professor Riesman goes on to say:

> At some research universities, graduate students are offered a financial aid package based primarily on need, often because they are regarded as necessary teaching or research assistants, or because they are regarded as members of a category or minority for whom compensatory justice is requisite. Some of the ablest students are put off by such offers of aid, which do not take into account their special qualities--no one seems to be betting on them as individuals. . . . The National Science Foundation predoctoral fellowships and the Danforth and Kent fellowships are among the very few instances of national competition that say to a prospective or enrolled graduate student that his or her self-esteem, shaky at best, is in fact justified. We need to maintain and increase the number of such fellowships based on merit.[17]

But the Fellowships have done more than merely reward merit.

They have provided a cadre of persons dedicated to the multi-faceted aspects of higher education. They have contributed to the training of many outstanding teachers who are committed not only to communicating knowledge but a sense of values as well. In a day when people seemingly

have few commitments, the Danforth Foundation has been successful in creating a real and vital sense of community for a large group of persons. Many Danforth and Kent Fellows have taken leadership roles in curricular changes on campus, have introduced and developed interdisciplinary courses, and have been involved in salutary institutional changes in colleges and universities across the country. The 1975 study of the Graduate Fellowships for Women indicated that many of the women were similarly involved in creating innovative courses as well as bringing new perspectives to academic decision making processes. The Fellowship Program has been unwavering in its efforts to provide ethical and educational leadership to many persons, some of whom might otherwise never have had the occasion or the stimulus to develop concerns for these values. Time and time again, data for this assessment have indicated the experience to have had a profound and pervasive influence in many important areas for recipients of Danforth and Kent Fellowships.

Nor is it the Fellowship holders alone who have benefited. In the broader sense of the meaning of fellowship, the Foundation's Fellowship activities have affected a wide range of people, most but not all in academia. The outreach has extended to readers of applications, to interviewers, to Advisory Council members who make final selections, to participants in workshops and conferences, to special consultants, and to the liaison officers on over 1,200 college and university campuses around the country. Persons involved in all of these activities, separate yet vital components of the Fellowship and essential to its success, have carried with them into their own milieu many of the values and concerns encountered while participating in the Danforth Program. It is clear from the evidence

that the vast majority of people involved in Fellowship activities over the years have found the experience to be truly significant in their lives. If one ultimate goal of higher education is to combine ethical and intellectual concerns with teaching and learning, then Danforth and Kent Fellowships have successfully motivated and sustained people toward the realization of that goal.

While they were having profound impact on individuals, however, the Fellowships made no headway in affecting the graduate schools either in their concern for teaching or, with rare exceptions, in providing any but the most haphazard preparation for future faculty members. No doubt it was naive to expect that merely by sending to the nation's leading graduate schools sizable numbers of subsidized students committed to careers in college teaching that the graduate schools would thereby become centers of higher pedagogy. Of course this didn't happen, and even the exhortations of leaders in higher education had little effect. At the 1956 Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, Clarence Faust, then President of the Fund for the Advancement of Education observed:

> . . . we tend to regard the production of good teachers as an incidental or even low aim of graduate study. . . . We must reverse the tendency to think of the production of college teachers as an unworthy purpose of graduate education. It must become a major concern.[18]

Despite such pleas, little happened to change the general picture.

By the mid-'sixties the Foundation had become sufficiently concerned to undertake support of several teaching internship programs, first at Yale and Washington Universities in 1963-64, and then additionally at Duke, Emory, and the University of Virginia in 1964-65. Cooperative projects with Antioch and Briarcliff Colleges were also funded that same year. But

even with special attention and funding, these programs met with meagre enthusiasm and lasted only as long as they were Foundation financed. More recently, the Foundation in 1974 financed a number of Centers for Teaching and Learning, three of them at major graduate universities. At one of the Centers attention has concentrated particularly on providing aid and counsel to teaching assistants, and even junior and senior faculty are beginning to evince interest. It is too early to determine results, but it is encouraging that these activities are now welcomed where once they were spurned. There is little question that attitudes toward the concept and practice of teaching in higher education are being affected by the general reexamination of traditions and patterns now underway in the nation's colleges and universities.

There is little question that American higher education is not and will not be the same as it was in 1951 when the Danforth Graduate Fellowships were established. Nor is that entirely lamentable, for change must be as much the law of academe as it is of societies generally. Yet curiously enough, the essential philosophy and purpose which have characterized the Fellowships throughout these years may be more timely than ever. One is reminded of the words of Emily Bronte's "Remembrance":

> Faithful, indeed, is the spirit that
> remembers
> After such years of change and suffering!

But it is not enough merely to remember the quality and success of the Danforth and Kent Graduate Fellowships which this study has amply demonstrated, laudable as they are. Neither is it enough to remember that through "years of change and suffering" the Danforth Program stood as a beacon of educational excellence. The Foundation must also remember its ongoing obligations and opportunities as a public trust.

In that spirit, we are confident the Board of Trustees will agree that a major mission of the Danforth Foundation is the continued strengthening of higher education through a Graduate Fellowship Program based on a commitment to ethical values and academic excellence.

VIII. The Danforth and Kent Fellowships
Some Further Considerations

The evidence accumulated for this quinquennial review of the Danforth and Kent Graduate Fellowships presents a remarkable record, a record conveyed only in part and less than perfectly by this report. Note again some of the highlights:

- The Fellowship competition has consistently attracted the top talent from colleges and universities
- Danforth and Kent Fellows were conspicuously successful in gaining admission to the nation's leading graduate schools
- 97% of Danforth and 98% of Kent Fellows completed doctoral degrees
- 82% of Danforth and 92% of Kent Fellows are currently in academic positions
- Danforth and Kent Fellows remain highly committed to ethical values in their personal and professional lives
- As faculty members Danforth and Kent Fellows maintain unusual balance between the demands of teaching and of research
- Danforth and Kent Fellows are highly esteemed as persons and as professionals by their campus peers and administrators
- The Fellowships have affected many others beyond the recipients, both within and outside the academic world, through the selection process, the conferences and workshops, the "fellowship of the Fellowships"
- Danforth and Kent Fellows maintain a high degree of social awareness and involvement

- Danforth and Kent Fellowships symbolize quality and excellence in the field of graduate education in the United States

If these findings are a source of satisfaction, they are also a reminder that there is still important work to do.

There are those who would argue that a philanthropic foundation is an anachronism, particularly so in the sphere of higher education where the prominence of state and federal governments now looms so large. Yet we would insist that it is precisely because of that prominence that private efforts are more crucial than ever, not only as countervailing forces to governmental power, but because they have the freedom and flexibility to do what governments so rarely can. As the Foundation's Annual Report for 1962-63 noted,

> . . . since the Foundation's purposes are to find and put trust in something as unpredictable as people, and to strengthen something as elusive as values, and to foster the process of examining something as debatable as the essential nature of the educational enterprise, then the recognition must be present that the result, whether success or failure, can never be wholly known. The Foundation has consciously chosen to undertake tasks that can never be completed, and has fully accepted the intriguing handicap of being continually uncertain about the final outcome. But surely this is the nature of education itself.[19]

It is true, of course, that we shall never know entirely how the Fellowships have affected all who held them, but what evidence we have is certainly impressive.

The Danforth Foundation has made a substantial contribution to higher education in the United States. Whatever the limitations of its resources may be in the years immediately ahead, we can only urge that the Foundation must at least endeavor to maintain an ongoing presence in an area so vital to the quality of American life. This study is convincing evidence that

the Danforth and Kent Graduate Fellowships are sufficiently unique and important to warrant indefinite continuation.

To those who would argue the folly of supporting the preparation of college teachers in a time of oversupply and shrinking demand, we would answer simply that there can never be an excess of excellence. Neither can we allow a hiatus in the infusion of new and vigorous younger people in the ranks of the academy. But, particularly important, the Danforth Foundation symbolizes a concern for human beings and humane values rarely matched in higher education.

An activity directly related to this study has been an intensive effort by Staff personnel to develop specific recommendations for future directions and emphases in the Foundation's ongoing involvement in graduate education. The document submitted separately represents a thoughtful and thorough proposal for reorganizing and strengthening the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program. We respectfully urge the Board of Trustees to accept and endorse that proposal, and toward its eventual implementation we would offer some further considerations.

1. That the Danforth Foundation reassess its own goals and commitments in the context of the Fellowship Program in order to determine what directions to pursue in the light of its changing financial situation.

2. That the Danforth Foundation express its support and where possible offer its assistance to protagonists of reform and improvement in graduate education in the United States.

3. That special consideration be given to the support of older students within the framework of the Fellowship Program; data from the GFW study indicated that a substantial number of recipients would not have gone to graduate school and on to subsequent success without that award.

4. That the "fellowship of the Fellowship" activities be continued and wherever possible augmented through national and regional conferences which serve as the primary means for transmitting and reinforcing the essential values of the Danforth Foundation.

5. That Danforth Fellows be used increasingly as consultants and leaders in Fellowship activities, particularly in conferences and workshops, as much to help them in renewing and developing their own commitment and concerns for ethical and educational issues as to provide models for younger Fellows in the process of graduate study.

6. That membership on the Advisory Councils, reading committees, interviewing panels, and planning groups be rotated on a regular basis to assure freshness of approach as well as to achieve the broadest impact of the Danforth experience.

7. That the orientation process for readers, interviewers, Advisory Council members, and others engaged in the selection process of the Fellowships be reviewed regularly to assure that the persons involved are conversant with the philosophy and purposes of the Program, so that nothing will be assumed or merely taken for granted.

8. That the use of liaison officers on individual campuses as the "official" nominators of Fellowship candidates be reexamined; are the L.O.'s doing their job effectively, and are they assuring that <u>every</u> potential candidate enters the competition, and do they fully understand the philosophy and purposes of the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program?

FOOTNOTES

[1]Breneman, David W. Graduate School Adjustments to the "New Depression" in Higher Education, Technical Report Number 3, February 1975. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, p. 11.

[2]Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Federal Policy and Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975, p. 8.

[3]Danforth Graduate Fellowships - Some Questions and Answers. St. Louis: The Danforth Foundation, July 1959, p. 7.

[4]Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program. St. Louis: The Danforth Foundation, Summer 1975, p. 4.

[5]Uchitelle, Susan. Review of the Graduate Fellowships for Women. St. Louis: The Danforth Foundation, 1975.

[6]Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program, op. cit., pp. 3, 4.

[7]Ibid., p. 4.

[8]Trow, Martin (ed.). Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975. One of the Carnegie Commission Reports on Higher Education.

[9]Kidd, Charles V. "Shifts in Doctorate Output: History and Outlook," Science, 9 February 1973, p. 538.

[10]The Ph.D. in English and Foreign Languages: A Conference Report. A Special Combined Issue of the Bulletins of the Associations of Departments of English and Foreign Languages, June 1973. New York: Association of Departments of English, 1973, p. 3.

[11]Breneman, David W. op. cit.

[12]Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education. Scholarship for Society: A Report on Emerging Roles and Responsibilities of Graduate Education in America. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

[13]Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[14]Federal Interagency Commission on Education. op. cit., p. 10.

[15]Ibid., p. 13.

[16]Riesman, David. "Thoughts on the Graduate Experience," Change, April 1976, p. 14.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Lindquist, Clarence B. NDEA Fellowshi for College Teaching, 1958-68, Title IV, National Defense Education Act of 1958. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1971, p. 4.

[19]Annual Report, 1962-63. St. Louis: The Danforth Foundation, 1963, p. 16.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Danforth Foundation files and archives provided much useful background for this study, including the following specific materials:

Annual Reports, 1960 through 1975, St. Louis.

Chandler, John H., and Dirks, J. Edward. Review of the Danforth Graduate and Kent Fellowship Programs: A Report to the Staff and Trustees of the Danforth Foundation. St. Louis, 1970.

Danforth Graduate Fellowships: Some Questions and Answers, St. Louis, 1959.

Jordaan, Jean Pierre. Study of Danforth Fellows: The Graduate School Years. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

Rice, R. Eugene. Danforth Fellows in Mid-Career: The Development of Teachers with Uncommon Promise. St. Louis, 1976.

Uchitelle, Susan. Review of the Graduate Fellowships for Women. St. Louis, 1975.

Wise, W. Max. A Report on Danforth Graduate Fellows Appointed 1952-1961. St. Louis, 1961.

_____. "Some Further Thoughts About the Danforth Foundation's Interest in the 'Personalization of Higher Education,'" St. Louis, 1964.

OTHER MATERIALS

BOOKS

Handlin, Oscar and Mary F. The American College and American Culture. An Essay Written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Graduate and Professional Education, 1980. An Essay Written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University, A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

ARTICLES and REPORTS

Association of Departments of English. The Ph.D. in English and Foreign Languages: A Conference Report. New York: Association of Departments of English, 1973.

Blackwell, James E. Access of Black Students to Graduate and Professional Schools. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1975.

Board on Human Resources Data and Analyses, Commission on Human Resources, National Research Council. Summary Report 1974 Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1975. Also Reports for 1972, 1973.

Breneman, David W. Graduate School Adjustments to the "New Depression" in Higher Education. Commentary by the National Board on Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1975.

_____. The Ph.D. Production Function: The Case at Berkeley. Ford Foundation Research Program, Office of the Vice President--Planning and Analysis. Berkeley: University of California, 1970.

_____. An Economic Theory of Ph.D. Production: The Case at Berkeley. (as above), 1970.

_____. The Ph.D. Degree at Berkeley: Interviews, Placement, and Recommendations. (as above), 1971.

Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society, "Doctoral Education in Chemistry: Facing the 1970's," Chemical and Engineering News, Vol. 50, August 14, 1972, pp. 35-39.

Creager, John A. A Survey Report Regarding Unsuccessful Candidates for NSF Graduate and Cooperative Graduate Fellowships, Special Report No. 3, Washington, D.C.: Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, 16 November 1965.

_____. Predicting Doctorate Attainment with GRE and Other Variables, Technical Report No. 15, . . . (as above), 16 November 1965.

_____. A Study of Graduate Fellowship Applicants in Terms of Ph.D. Attainment, Technical Report No. 18, ... (as above), 22 March 1961.

_____, and Harmon, Lindsey R. On-the-Job Validation of Selection Variables, Technical Report No. 26, ... (as above), 15 April 1966.

Department of Economics. Economic Internship Program at Washington University St. Louis: Washington University, 1968.

Dresch, Stephen P. "Research, Graduate Education, and the University," Educational Record, Summer 1974, pp. 171-176.

El-Khawas, Elaine H. and Kinzer, Joan. Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D. Granting Institutions, Higher Education Panel Reports, Number 19. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.

Federal Interagency Committee on Education. Federal Policy and Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1975.

Hamilton, I. Bruce. Graduate School Programs for Minorities/Disadvantaged Students. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

_____. Some Issues and Examples of Alternate Modes of Graduate Education: A Discussion Paper. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Harmon, Lindsey R. The Effect of Fellowships on Acceleration of Ph.D. Attainment, Technical Report No. 14. Washington, D.C.: Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, 15 January 1959.

_____. Fourteen Years of Research on Fellowship Selection. Publication 1420. (as above), 1966.

_____. Validation of Fellowship Selection Instruments Against a Provisional Criterion of Scientific Accomplishment. Technical Report No. 15 (as above), 15 December 1959.

Lindquist, Clarence, ed. NDEA Fellowships for College Teaching 1958-1968, Title IV, NDEA 1958. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1971.

Lear, Maryann. Graduate and Professional School Opportunities for Minority Students, Sixth Edition, 1975-77. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Millett, John D. "The Public Interest in Graduate Education," Educational Record, Spring 1974, pp. 79-86.

Panel on Alternate Approaches to Higher Education. Scholarship for Society, A Report on Emerging Roles and Responsibilities of Graduate Education in America. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Riesman, David. "Thoughts on the Graduate Experience," Change, April 1976, pp. 11-16.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Graduate Education and Ethnic Minorities. Boulder, Colo.: WICHE, 1970.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

The appendices include the following material:

A. Correspondence

Page		
A-1	Letter to Fellows	
A-2	Letter to WW persons	
A-3	Letter to near misses	
A-4	Questionnaire to all Fellows	
A-5	Questionnaire to all WW persons	
A-6	Questionnaire to near misses	
A-7	Follow up letter (1)	
A-8	Follow up letter (2)	
A-9	Letter to readers, interviewers, advisory council members and consultants	
A-10	Letter to Deans, Vice-Presidents and/or Provosts	

B. Interview Materials

Page		
B-1	Letter to interviewers	
B-2	Guidelines for interviews	
B-3	Questions for the interview	
B-4	Sample of information sent to interviewers	
B-5	Number of interviews and locations	

C. Examples of Past Conferences

Page		
C-1	Regional	1966
C-2	Regional	1970
C-3	New Fellows	1970
C-4	Final Year	1970

D. Samples of Past Announcements of Fellowship Program

Page		
D-1	Danforth	1960
D-2	Danforth	1966
D-3	Danforth	1970
D-4	Danforth	1975
D-5	Kent	1961
D-6	Kent	1966
D-7	Kent	1970
D-8	Kent	1975

E. Directors of the Danforth Graduate Fellowship Program

Page
E-1

F. Advisory Councils for Danforth and Kent Fellowship Programs

Page
F-1 DF Advisory Council
F-2 Kent Advisory Council

G. Danforth and Kent Fellows

Page
G-1 Danforth Fellows 1960, 1966, 1970
G-2 Graduate Institutions for Danforth Fellows
G-3 Kent Fellows

H. Danforth and Kent Fellows Currently Teaching
Who they are and where they teach

Page
H-1 Danforth Fellows - Eastern Region
H-2 Danforth Fellows - Midwestern Region
H-3 Danforth Fellows - Western Region
H-4 Kent Fellows - Eastern Region
H-5 Kent Fellows - Midwestern Region
H-6 Kent Fellows - Western Region

I. Expenditures

Page
I-1

J. Position Papers

Page
J-1 Martin Kaplan, Aspen Institute.
J-2 Louis O. Mink, Professor of Philosophy, Wesleyan University.

NOTE

Because of their number and weight, the Appendices are not attached to this copy of the Fellowship Report. Readers interested in having copies of the Appendices may request them by writing to:

Dr. Warren Bryan Martin, Vice President
The Danforth Foundation
222 South Central Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105.